ıia

H3851 F4.5
B106.
Collection

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/eminentpersonsbi05timeiala

EMINENT PERSONS

EMINENT PERSONS

BIOGRAPHIES

REPRINTED FROM *THE TIMES*

VOLUME V

1891—1892

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.
AND The Times OFFICE, PRINTING HOUSE SQUARE
1896

All rights reserved

CONTENTS

	PAGE
A. W. Kinglake	1
George Bancroft	8
Charles Bradlaugh	14
General Sherman	19
Prince Napoleon	30
Lord Granville	39
Field-Marshal von Moltke	54
Archbishop Magee	83
Sir John Macdonald	90
James Russell Lowell	100
Jules Grévy	109
General Boulanger	118
W. H. Smith	125
Charles Stewart Parnell	133
Lord Lytton	147
The Ex-Emperor of Brazil	153
The Duke of Devonshire	162
Sir William White	173

PAGE

Sir George Airy 178

Tewfik Pasha, Khedive of Egypt 183

Cardinal Manning 190

Mr. Spurgeon 203

Sir James Caird 211

Viscount Hampden 216

Professor E. A. Freeman 221

Walt Whitman 226

Lord Bramwell 230

Thomas Cooper 239

Viscount Sherbrooke 246

John Greenleaf Whittier 255

M. Renan 263

Lord Tennyson 272

Sir Richard Owen 291

A. W. KINGLAKE

1811–1891

Obituary Notice, Saturday, January 3, 1891

The death of Mr. Kinglake, which took place at his London residence on Friday afternoon, can only be regarded as a merciful release from sufferings endured with characteristic fortitude. For long his life must have been somewhat burdensome. Though he loved to seclude himself with his work and his books, to the last he was eminently sociable, and his growing deafness must have been exquisitely trying to a man who was morbidly sensitive to the *finesse* of intellect and the refinements of thought.

But more serious trials were to follow. Cancer laid hold of the roots of the tongue, and painful operations only brought temporary relief. The pen fell from the hand of the brilliant historian, and it was sad for his friends to have their inquiries as to his health answered by the Sister of Charity who acted as his amanuensis. Subsequently he rallied wonderfully and almost recovered any cheerfulness he had lost.

Nearly to the last, so far as possible, he had been faithful to his old habits and to his favourite haunts. His mother, as he tells us in *Eothen*, had taught him in earliest childhood to find a home in the saddle; but many years ago, as he felt infirmities stealing upon him, he had given up his morning canters in the Park. Till recently the best part of his days were spent in the bright rooms in Hyde Park Place, looking through the smoke

of Belgravia to the Surrey Hills. There he never seemed to consider a visit an intrusion, so long as the caller was in any way congenial.

His, in the latter and even in earlier days, was always a kind of busy idleness. Perpetually occupied, and even consenting to much indispensable drudgery, he would always take his own time, and passively protest against being over-driven. Sacks of Crimean correspondence might be seen standing at his elbow, which his patient acuteness was to overhaul in due course. Very late in the afternoon he would take a cab down to Pall-Mall, where his clubs, the Travellers' and the Athenæum, stand conveniently side by side. The Athenæum was his habitual place of resort. He was something of a *bon vivant*, and his *petit diner soigné* would be served, as a rule, at the small round table, in the north-eastern corner of the dining-room.

Till death stepped in to make a melancholy clearance, the same quartette was to be seen there most evenings, although there might often be an additional guest. There was Mr. Hayward, one of Kinglake's closest and dearest friends, who, like Kinglake, had been gradually giving up general society; there was also Mr. Chenery, and Sir Henry Bunbury. The privileged strangers admitted to the select little company were sure to carry away delightful impressions, especially when Kinglake and Hayward could be led on to cap reminiscences. Both the men had marvellous memories; both had the art of giving point and picturesqueness to anecdotes; both had known more or less intimately almost every one who was worth the knowing, and could hit off a high character in a single sharp touch with an appropriate reminiscence by way of illustration.

A milder-mannered man than Mr. Kinglake never lived. He had the gentle and courteous formality of the old school; and he would breathe out a stinging epigram with a deprecatory softness that appeared oddly incongruous. It needed some such reminder to persuade you that the kindly and soft-spoken gentleman could be a terrible and most inveterate enemy, when he chose to consider it his mission to advocate a cause or assail a reputation. Possibly he might have made his mark at the Bar had he stuck to it; but his temperament was more that of the advocate or of the criminal prosecutor than of the Judge. He could see but a single side of a case, and as he read up his

brief and assimilated his materials, prepossessions and prejudices grew to settled convictions. Thenceforward the obtaining a verdict became a matter of pride and conscience with the historian. No one knew better how to tone down the virulence of invective by admissions in favour of the victim, more damaging than the most stinging sarcasm. But at all events, he had one qualification of the capable Judge—he serenely set at defiance men whose regard he must have valued. There was no questioning his literary courage, and it was of a somewhat rare kind, as he had exceptional opportunities of showing. In his history he dealt hard measure indiscriminately to the leading members of the House of Commons in which he sat; to some of the men who gave the laws to London society; even to the chiefs of the party he consistently supported.

The eldest son of Mr. Kinglake of Wiltonhouse, near Taunton, Alexander William Kinglake was born in 1811. He has said something in *Eothen* of his earliest education. "The most humble and pious of women was yet so proud a mother that she could teach her first-born son no Watts's Hymns—no collects for the day; she could teach him in earliest childhood no less than this—to find a home in his saddle and to love old Homer and all that Homer sung." The light of those "heroic days" was overclouded when he went to school, doomed to grind over "vile, monkish, doggerel grammars and graduses, etc.," and from a private school it was a relief to be sent to Eton, where he could at least go his own way out of school hours and indulge his favourite tastes.

He was to complete an irregular education by travel, for shortly after graduating at Cambridge he started on his memorable Eastern tour, and *Eothen* was the result. Slight as it professed to be, its publication was characteristically deferred, and he is said literally to have laid to heart the sarcastic advice of Pope, when the Twickenham sage counsels a writer to keep his piece for nine years. *Eothen* came out in 1844, and the writer, like Byron, awoke to find himself famous. There was a charm and a freshness about these sketches of travel, which recommended them at once to all cultivated readers. We may be sure, from what we know of Kinglake's subsequent literary methods, that during those nine years of incubation the file had been assiduously applied, and that the first careless familiarity of the language had been studiously revised.

In 1837 he had been called to the Bar; but he took to the work listlessly, and probably with neither the intention nor expectation of succeeding. With politics it was very different. From first to last he was a keen and earnest politician, at least on questions that chanced to interest him or appeal to his sympathies. He was a man with quiet ambitions, and a full consciousness of his own remarkable powers, and, doubtless, on entering for a Parliamentary career, he dreamed of far higher distinction than he attained. Be that as it may, in the spring of 1857 he was brought in as a Liberal for Bridgwater—a borough in his own county. He had hardly sat in the House for a year when we find him moving the first amendment against the Conspiracy Bill. The matter of the speech is excellent; occasionally he rose to the occasion in passages of genuine eloquence; but the manner of his delivery was far from impressive, and his feebleness of voice was greatly against him. He failed to hold the attention of an assembly which missed the essential links in his arguments.

Always a zealous champion of the oppressed, he interposed in favour of the unfortunate crew of the *Cagliari*, who had fallen into the clutches of the tyrannical Government of Naples, and of the crew of the *Charles and George*, in whose case the principles of international law had been even more grossly outraged by the Portuguese. But naturally he was never more in his element than when denouncing, in 1860, the Imperial annexation of Savoy and Nice. The Emperor of the French had invariably been his *bête noire*, and he happened to be specially well-informed as to the facts of the *coup d'état*, as revealed by the late Mr. Laurence Oliphant in his *Recollections*. Oliphant and Kinglake were intimate acquaintances, and had frequently discussed that scandalous piece of statecraft. We may add that at the election of 1868 he was again returned for the little Somersetshire borough, but only to lose his seat on petition.

It was in 1856 that the opportunity offered for the work on which his fame will rest. Lady Raglan requested him to write the history of the Crimean Campaign down to the death of her husband, placing at his disposal the mass of letters and papers in her possession. We can understand the motives that influenced Lady Raglan's selection of an historian, or rather of a biographer, for in fact the volumes are mainly the life of the Commander-in-Chief.

Nor as the guardian of Lord Raglan's memory had she reason to regret her choice. Kinglake had been his personal friend, and had ridden with his staff after the landing in the Crimea. He was sure to say all, and perhaps even more than all, that might be fairly said in favour of the friend he enthusiastically admired. He had made the theories of warfare his study, and General Hamley admitted afterwards, in an article in *Blackwood* that stung him deeply, that he "dealt extremely well with the technicalities of the military art." Indeed, he had been more than a mere student. In 1845 his interest in military operations had led him, in Dugald Dalgetty's language, to take a turn with the French flying columns in Algeria, when they were carrying fire and sword among the Arabs and the Kabyles. He had accompanied St. Arnaud's "Infernal" column on the march, and, we presume, had accepted St. Arnaud's hospitality, when the future chief of the French forces in the Crimea was contemplating and "concealing from every officer and man around him a deed of such a kind that few men, perhaps, have ever done the like of it in secret." When war had been proclaimed with the Czar, Kinglake was one of the first of the English travelling gentlemen who found their way to Constantinople. None of those amateurs were more favoured. He landed with the army of invasion, he was present at the battle of the Alma, and he remained long enough before Sebastopol to see the earlier developments of the siege works.

The first volumes of the history were eagerly expected. The fruit of seven years of labour, they appeared in 1863. Not only had he used the materials in possession of Lady Raglan, but when it was known that he had gone, as may be said, officially to work, communications poured in upon him from England, France, and even Russia, and from men who had been more or less conspicuous in the war. Naturally the book created a wide sensation. It was evident that the writer had put his whole heart and mind into the work. As for the faults, they were often such as rather added to its popularity than detracted from it. When it came into the hands of the critics, whether they regarded it from the literary or the military point of view, strictures of extreme severity were freely mingled with the praise. And some of the critics were military men in the highest rank as soldiers and strategists.

The narrative was condemned as digressive and discursive. But it was admitted on the whole that the author of *Eothen* had surmounted the seemingly insurmountable difficulty of throwing a fascination over tedious diplomatic negotiations and the dry *réchauffé* of Blue-books. Again, as in *Eothen*, the initiated thought they recognised laborious artifice under the affectation of a rough simplicity. How he had weighed each epithet may be judged by the fact that in the rare corrections to a subsequent edition he modified the word "sprung," as going beyond the truth, and "expressing undue celerity of movement." He certainly twisted facts to suit his theories. At the same time, we believe that he wrote in perfect honesty and good faith. In fact, like Mr. Gladstone, he could persuade himself of anything, and, when he had once been converted by his own sophistries, he made it his business to convince other people.

There was no denying the life-like resemblance of his portraiture, but the very excellence of the likeness made many of them aggravating caricatures. The noblest is perhaps that of Todleben, and it is Todleben who is the real hero of the seventh volume. Lord Raglan was inevitably flattered ; and it is strange that so quick-witted a writer as Kinglake should not have perceived that much which he means for praise is really blame or irony. Kinglake delights to glorify Lord Raglan's generalship. Yet he represents him at the Alma, sitting serene like Jove upon a mound, calmly surveying sublunary affairs through the cannons' smoke, and declining to interfere by aides-de-camp or otherwise.

As for the public men whom Kinglake misunderstood or failed to appreciate, or whose conduct he condemned upon public grounds, he etches rather than paints them. Elaborate etchings they are, in which dark shadows predominate, but faintly relieved by fitful gleams of light. The likeness is touched and retouched with the needle of steel, and each feature is burned in with biting acid. Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Palmerston, above all "the brethren of the Élysée," are cases in point. Reading between the lines of the history, we see that Nicholas, and not Napoleon, was the real author of the war.

Unquestionably the Mephistopheles of Kinglake was for the time the Dictator of France ; he was irresponsible, except to

himself, for the issues of peace and war. But the historian goes so far as to assert that the Ministers of England had become his servile puppets. He maintains that, exacting the very letter of his bond, Napoleon had actually dictated to Lord Aberdeen the most significant passages of her Majesty's speech when war and peace were trembling in the balance. We need add no more to indicate the lengths to which he would push a favourite prejudice. We have deemed it right to indicate the fundamental faults which detract from the value of one of the most brilliant of English histories. But it is that history of the Crimean war which will hand the name of Kinglake down to posterity; and it is but right that in doing justice to his literary genius we should show the injustices into which he was betrayed by his one-sided views and the temperament of a partisan.

We have treated the work as a whole; but, though 1863 saw the publication of the first volumes, the last volume did not issue from the press till within a very few years of the writer's death. In fact the book completely occupied half his life. We may add a word or two as to his long connection with his publishers, the Blackwoods. In August 1862 he wrote his first letter to the late Mr. John Blackwood, enclosing an introduction from Sir Henry Drummond Wolff. We believe, by the way, that both Kinglake and Sir Henry had been frequent contributors to the *Owl*, the precursor of the social journals, during its brief but brilliant existence. Mr. Laurence Oliphant happened to be on a visit to Mr. Blackwood at his place near St. Andrews when the letter arrived. Mr. Blackwood said, in answering the letter, "What he (Oliphant) says increases my desire to make further acquaintance with you, and he wishes we could meet." There is a confidential letter to his manager next day, "Oliphant tells me Kinglake is a monstrous clever fellow and a real good one, but most particular and confoundedly fidgety about what he writes." This was fully confirmed by the subsequent experience of the firm, down to the issue of the concluding volume of the work, but the "confounded fidgetiness" never interrupted cordial business relations and close friendship. If Kinglake's life is ever written at length, we believe that invaluable materials for it will be found in his long and voluminous correspondence with Mr. Blackwood, which not only is full of personal details, but forms a consecutive commentary on the progress of his history.

GEORGE BANCROFT

1800–1891

OBITUARY NOTICE, MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1891

IN the death of Mr. George Bancroft America loses not only its foremost historian, but a veteran statesman and diplomatist. His literary career extended over upwards of half a century, and his public and political for nearly the same period. George Bancroft was born at Worcester, Massachusetts, on 3rd October 1800. He was the son of the Rev. Aaron Bancroft, a distinguished Congregational (Unitarian) minister; and it is an extraordinary fact that the lives of these two men, father and son, carry us back to the time of George II., for the Rev. Aaron Bancroft was born in the year 1755, five years before the commencement of the long reign of George III.

The future historian was educated first at Exeter, New Hampshire, and subsequently at Harvard College. His intellectual powers were unusually keen and assimilative, and before he had completed his 17th year young Bancroft received his degree of Bachelor of Arts. He next proceeded to the German Universities, and, after two years' study at Göttingen, in 1820 he received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. His literary studies were of the most cosmopolitan character, including the German, French, and Italian masterpieces, the Oriental languages, Scripture, ecclesiastical, ancient, and natural history, the antiquities and literature of Greece and Rome, and Greek philosophy. Visiting Berlin, Mr. Bancroft found that there was a great stirring in philosophical questions, and his mind received stimulus and expansion by constant intercourse with Wilhelm von Humboldt, Lappenberg, Savigny, and others.

From Berlin he proceeded on a tour through other parts of Europe. At Heidelberg he experienced the personal influence of the historian Schlosser, and at Jena he became acquainted with Goethe. In Paris he met with several great thinkers, including Alexander von Humboldt, Cousin, and Benjamin Constant. Probably no literary man was ever more fortunate in making the personal acquaintance of celebrated contemporary writers. At Milan Bancroft enjoyed the friendship of Manzoni, and at Rome that of Bunsen and of Niebuhr.

Returning to the United States, he acted for a year as Greek tutor at Harvard, and, as he was destined for the ministry, he also preached occasional sermons ; but, his bent being decidedly towards literature, he abandoned the pulpit for the pen. He issued a volume of poems at Boston in 1823, and contributed a great number of articles to the American reviews. In conjunction with Dr. J. G. Cogswell, he founded the Round Hill School at Northampton, Massachusetts, a distinguished nursery of learning, where Motley, the historian, amongst others, was educated. About this time Mr. Bancroft translated Heeren's *Politics of Ancient Greece;* also the same author's histories of *The States of Antiquity*, and of *The Political System of Europe and its Colonies, from the Discovery of America to the Successful Termination of the Struggle for Freedom of the British Colonies.*

In 1834 appeared the first-fruits of Mr. Bancroft's close and laborious study of the history of his own country and people. He now issued the initial volume of his *History of the United States, from the Discovery of the American Continent*, his greatest and most original work, with which his name will be enduringly associated. It revealed a grasp of historical fact and a comprehensiveness of treatment which took readers by surprise. But while now devoted to historical study, Mr. Bancroft was also an active politician. He threw in his lot with the Democratic party, and became a frequent speaker on Democratic platforms. In 1838 he was appointed, by President Van Buren, collector of the port of Boston, and with the characteristic energy of his nature he effected a revolution in the transaction of the business of his office. It is also interesting to note that during his tenure of this post Mr. Bancroft appointed to an office at Salem the well-known novelist, Nathaniel Hawthorne. In 1837 appeared the second, and in 1840 the third volume of Mr. Bancroft's *History*, and in 1844 he was nominated by the Democratic party

for the Governorship of Massachusetts. Although not elected, he polled more votes than any other candidate ever did on the purely Democratic ticket.

The following year he entered the Cabinet of President Polk as Secretary of the Navy. He again showed capacity and vigour in administration and in the introduction of reforms. He founded the Naval School at Annapolis, and greatly extended the Astronomical Observatory at Washington. In 1846 Mr. Bancroft accepted the appointment of Minister Plenipotentiary to Great Britain, and for three years he resided in this country. During his sojourn he was thrown into the society of our most distinguished men, including Peel, Brougham, and others, in politics; and Macaulay, Hallam, Grote, Dickens, and others, in literature. The Government of the day, of which Lord John Russell was the head, greatly aided him in his historical researches by placing at his disposal the records of the State Paper Office, containing a great accumulation of military, civil, legal, and general correspondence. Lord John Russell likewise opened the records of the Treasury Department to him, and he was made free of the archives of the British Museum and of many noble families. The same good fortune attended him in Paris, where he received much practical aid from Guizot, Lamartine, Mignet, and De Tocqueville. Mr. Bancroft signalised his mission at St. James's by many important acts, not the least of which was his successful intervention with the British Ministry for the adoption of more liberal laws of navigation. Before he left England the University of Oxford conferred upon him the honorary degree of D.C.L.

On his return to the United States, Mr. Bancroft settled down to his historical labours. The fourth and fifth volumes of his great work appeared in 1852, the sixth in 1854, the seventh in 1858, and the eighth, which brought the narrative down to the Declaration of Independence, in 1860. But there were occasions when he could not resist the claims made upon him from the outside world; and accordingly we find records of addresses upon such subjects as Channing, Prescott, Washington Irving, Andrew Jackson, "The Culture, the Support, and the Object of Art in a Republic," and "The Necessity, the Reality, and the Promise of the Progress of the Human Race."

On the assassination of President Lincoln, Mr. Bancroft was specially desired to pronounce a eulogy upon him by the

municipal Government of New York ; and shortly afterwards he pronounced a second oration upon the life and services of Lincoln in the House of Representatives at Washington. In 1866 appeared the ninth volume of the *History*, embracing the period from the formal establishment of the Confederation in July 1776 to the alliance of France with America in 1778.

Mr. Bancroft was appointed Minister Plenipotentiary to Berlin in 1867. While at this court he negotiated a treaty with the North German Confederation, which mutually recognised the right of expatriation and naturalisation. Other treaties with the then separate States of Baden, Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Hesse-Darmstadt followed. The degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred upon him by the University of Bonn, at its semi-centennial jubilee in 1868, his name coming next to that of the King, and being followed by those of Grimm, Darwin, Stuart Mill, and others. In 1868 Mr. Bancroft was accredited to the North German Confederation, and in 1871 to the German Empire. On the fiftieth anniversary of his Göttingen doctorate the German Emperor presented him with his portrait in oil, full size, and bearing the inscription, "The Emperor William I. to his friend George Bancroft, in remembrance of the years 1867-74." The American representative rendered an important service to his country by securing the arbitration and favourable award of the German Emperor in the establishment of the boundary line between Vancouver's Island and Washington territory through the Haro Channel. For this service he received the marked commendation of President Grant in his message of 1872. The award of Germany secured to the United States the islands of San Juan and the adjacent waters.

Mr. Bancroft resigned the charge at Berlin in 1874, and took up his abode at Washington, concluding in the year of his return the tenth volume of his *History*, which brought the narrative down to the Treaty of Peace in 1782. Writing of this work on one occasion, Baron Bunsen said :—"I read last night Bancroft, with increasing admiration. What a glorious and interesting history has he given to his nation of the centuries before the Independence ! The third volume is a masterpiece. After having displayed all the plans and decrees of the monarchs of Europe from 1741 to 1748, he brings in 'the son of a widow,

gaining his livelihood by surveying land in remote and uninhabited districts—George Washington.'"

The historian now devoted himself to another task, which naturally followed on, however, and supplemented his previous labours. This was a continuation of the greater narrative, in the shape of a *History of the Formation of the Constitution*, which appeared in two volumes early in 1882, being thus written when its author was an octogenarian. "With the indefatigable love of labour which distinguished him, the venerable historian had scarcely taken his hand from the concluding page of these last volumes before he turned with impatience to begin the task of a thorough revision of the entire work." This undertaking he pursued with unflagging energy and vigour for one of his advanced years. Mr. Bancroft's *History of the United States* has been translated into several European languages, and it has met with special and wide recognition in Germany.

In person Mr. Bancroft was strong and muscular. At the age of eighty-three he spent the latter part of each afternoon in the saddle, riding from twenty to thirty-five miles, and managing his steed, mounting and alighting with the agility of a young man. He took great interest in floriculture, and devoted his hours of relaxation for many years to the enthusiastic culture of the rose. It is stated that his collections, both at Washington and at his summer residence at Newport, Rhode Island, surpassed in number and variety, and also in perfection, any other private collections in the country.

Mr. Bancroft was not one to make violent friendships; he required to be known to be adequately appreciated, but those who were honoured with his friendship recognised his sterling worth and the solidity of his character. We cannot close this notice, without recalling an incident in his career, which seems to connect a bygone age of literature with the present. It occurred in 1821, the chief actors in it being Lord Byron and Bancroft. The famous poet was in his vessel lying off Leghorn when Bancroft was introduced to him. Something in the manner of the young American greatly struck Byron, and he begged him to visit him at his villa, Montenero, near the city. Lord Byron asked many questions concerning America, and, turning to literary matters, denied the charge of Goethe that he had modelled his *Manfred* upon *Faust*. The poet was then writing *Don Juan*. "People call it immoral," he said, "and

put *Roderick Random* in their libraries. So of Shelley, they call him an infidel," said Byron, "but he is more Christian than the whole of them." When Bancroft was leaving, Byron took down the last cantos of his poem and wrote his name in them, as "a remembrance from Noel Byron." "That is fame," Byron exclaimed, on learning that a copy of the *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* had been found at Niagara. The noble poet and the young literary spirit from America spent a long and cordial afternoon together. It is strange to reflect that while Byron only saw the light twelve years before Bancroft, the historian survived him by no less a period than sixty-seven years, as Byron died in 1824.

CHARLES BRADLAUGH

1833–1891

OBITUARY NOTICE, SATURDAY, JANUARY 31, 1891

CHARLES BRADLAUGH was born 26th September, 1833, at Hoxton. His father was a lawyer's clerk, and, according to the testimony of his son, William Bradlaugh, "one of the kindest, noblest, and best men that ever lived." His son Charles was, for a time, employed in the same office as his father. He subsequently acted as a wharf clerk, and in the course of his many employments he was successively a coal merchant and a traveller for a manufacturer of buckskin braces. He was precociously intelligent, and at a very early age he was an active Sunday school teacher under the Rev. Mr. Packer, of St. Peter's, Hackney Road. He fell under the influence of the friends and disciples of Richard Carlile, the once famous editor of the *Republican and Prompter*, and the hero of half a dozen prosecutions for blasphemy and sedition; and by nineteen Bradlaugh had become known on Hackney Downs and in Victoria Park as a fluent advocate of freethought.

He did not prosper in business, and he gladly availed himself for some months of the hospitality of Mrs. Carlile, the widow of Richard Carlile. In his distress he decided to enlist as a soldier, and the 7th Dragoon Guards welcomed the tall, stalwart recruit. About this part of Mr. Bradlaugh's life, and, in fact, about many passages in his early years, there is obscurity—his own accounts of them are not always quite consistent. There are traditions that while with his regiment in Kildare and Dublin he read much, that once at least he distinguished himself as a pugilist,

that he was an earnest advocate of teetotalism, and a champion of popular rights. What is certain is that he became orderly clerk, that he disliked soldiering, and that he managed to purchase his discharge in 1853, taking with him a good character from his colonel. He returned to London, and again got, apparently with some difficulty, employment as a lawyer's clerk. The first of the Common Law Procedure Acts was then coming into operation; in the applications made at Chambers there was an opportunity for adroitness and astuteness; and Bradlaugh was quick to profit by the chance. At all events, he picked up that knowledge of legal forms and processes of which he made effective use in later years. While in the office of Mr. Rogers of Fenchurch Street, and other solicitors, he lectured on religious subjects.

In a few years he ceased to be a lawyer's clerk, and as "Iconoclast," the representative of pugnacious, aggressive atheism, he began that career of pamphleteering and lecturing which made his name repulsive to the majority of his countrymen. From town to town he travelled, preaching freethought, and was the chief figure in little-edifying platform encounters, in which well-meaning, ill-advised advocates of orthodoxy were persuaded to take part. He aspired to the place which Paine, Richard Carlile, Robert Taylor, and Charles Southwell had successively occupied; and he succeeded. He possessed considerable powers of speech, and the courage needed to face an angry mob or a hostile audience. The hard, reckless way in which he touched sacred themes, his arrogance and ever present egotism, made him offensive even to many who thought as he did. But he won platform victories; and he elicited a certain admiration by his ingenuity in his far from few legal difficulties —for example, when he foiled the Devonport authorities by lecturing from a boat moored in deep water only a few yards from a large audience ranged along the shore. In the Hall of Science and the pages of the *National Reformer* he advocated Republicanism and Secularism, and inflamed the not inconsiderable number of his followers with hopes of what he would accomplish when he entered the House. Several times he tried, without success, to get a seat. At last, in April 1880, he was returned for Northampton.

Then began a long course of litigation, which had the effect of making Mr. Bradlaugh known to those who had scarcely

heard of "Iconoclast." He had always been prone to show his legal acumen. He sued in 1861 the superintendent of police at Devonport for interfering with his lectures, but recovered only a farthing damages, and for the first time figured in the law reports—wherein his name was afterwards so prominent—by moving unsuccessfully in the Court of Common Pleas for a new trial. He was more successful in defying the Inland Revenue in an attempt to enforce an obsolete Act against the *National Reformer*. In 1877 he and Mrs. Besant were indicted for publishing an obscene book, *The Fruits of Philosophy*, and they were sentenced to six months' imprisonment and a fine of £200. The conviction, however, was ultimately quashed on technical grounds; the pleader had omitted to set out in the indictment the entire book, or so much of it as was complained of.

While in Parliament Mr. Bradlaugh spent most of his time for several sessions in trying to remove the barrier opposed to his taking his seat by the form of the oath of allegiance. When elected he claimed to be entitled to affirm under the Parliamentary Oaths Act, 1866, and the Evidence Acts, 1869 and 1870. A Select Committee, by a majority of one, reported against his claim. Then, to the amazement of his friends, he claimed on May 21 the right to take the oath. A Select Committee decided against his competence, and the House proceeded to pass a resolution denying his right either to take the oath or to affirm. Refusing to recognise the authority of the House, he was removed by the Serjeant-at-Arms. An action for enormous penalties, for having sat and voted without having first taken the oath, was begun. It is unnecessary to recall all the subsequent intricate steps of the struggle waged from 1880 to 1885, the athletic performances in the House of Commons whereby he sought to secure his seat, or the memorable 21st of February 1882, whereon, before an amazed House, he stepped to the table, drew a Testament from his pocket, and administered the oath to himself.

Successively excluded by the House and invariably re-elected by his constituents, he was allowed in 1886 to take the oath, and two sessions afterwards the principles for which he had contended triumphed by the passing of the Oaths Act. In that interval Mr. Bradlaugh was rarely out of litigation, which he conducted with rare skill, but with a clever layman's weakness

for dwelling *inter apices juris* and for pushing technicalities to extremes. In "The Queen *v.* Bradlaugh," "Clarke *v.* Bradlaugh," "Bradlaugh *v.* Erskine," and "Bradlaugh *v.* Gosset," he showed remarkable acuteness. The decision of the House of Lords in "Clarke *v.* Bradlaugh" was that the writs against him were so much waste paper. A scarcely less important victory was that which he achieved in the action which he brought with success against Mr. Newdegate for maintenance.

Since he was permitted to take his seat, Mr. Bradlaugh has been less heard of. But the part of his life to be regarded with most satisfaction was the last. The junior member for Northampton had little resemblance to "Iconoclast," the lecturer of the Hall of Science, or the Republican editor of the *National Reformer*. Of late, and especially since his visit to India, he sought to become the champion of Hindoo claims for representation; and if his advocacy of this cause showed no great knowledge, it was conducted with no needless acrimony. To one of his last speeches of importance in the House of Commons, on the report of the Select Committee on Perpetual Pensions — his favourite theme of denunciation—no exception could be reasonably taken. He grew in moderation and decorousness. He kept his irreligious opinions in the background. He learned perhaps to understand much of what he had scoffed at; and more than once he set an example to those who ought to have known better. With Socialism he had no sympathy, and he declined to purchase support by flattering it. He showed by his conduct in regard to the Employers' Liability Bill, and, more recently, in regard to the Eight Hours Movement, that he dared risk his popularity.

His Parliamentary achievements, in a time unfavourable to the efforts of private members, were considerable, and they were due to the qualities wherein his strength lay—a dogged perseverance and an eminently practical bent of mind—together with the respect which he succeeded in extorting from all parties in the House, and which grew rapidly in the last few years. This feeling culminated in the unopposed motion carried on Tuesday last, whereby the House decided to expunge the resolution of 22nd June 1880, which refused him permission to take the oath or to affirm. It was a pathetic circumstance that when the news of this arrived Mr. Bradlaugh had already passed

into unconsciousness. Mr. Bradlaugh was not even a Wilkes, far less a Danton, as his flatterers told him. Nor was he the mediocrity which his many enemies among working men described him. He was a remarkable figure of a somewhat obsolete type.

GENERAL SHERMAN

1820–1891

Obituary Notice, Monday, February 16, 1891

William Tecumseh Sherman, General in the United States Army, the hero of the campaign in Tennessee, the victor of Atlanta, the projector, organiser, and leader of that famous march across Georgia to Savannah, which practically brought the War of Secession to an end, was one of the most distinguished soldiers of modern times. In the great war which revealed to the world the political gifts and the civil virtues of Abraham Lincoln and the military genius of Grant and Lee, of Sheridan and Stonewall Jackson, not to mention other heroes of the time, no one achieved a higher fame or rendered more distinguished services to his country than the brilliant and successful commander who has just passed away. The burden which Lincoln bore was a heavier one, and the position occupied by Grant at the end of the war was more distinguished and responsible, but even Lincoln's measures might have been frustrated and Grant's strategy might have failed if they had not found in Sherman a man who was worthy to rank with the one in steadfastness and determination, and with the other in military genius and daring. Like so many of the great commanders produced by the war, General Sherman was trained at the United States Military Academy, at West Point. Military genius is a special and native gift, and science does not make the soldier. But though the great soldier is born he also requires to be made, and the military history of the great War of Secession is a signal illustration of the importance of systematic training even to the born commander.

William T. Sherman's father was a lawyer, of Lancaster, Ohio, who, for five years before his death, in 1829, occupied the position of Judge of the Supreme Court of his State. The family was descended from one Samuel Sherman, who went to America from Essex in 1634, accompanied by his brother, the Rev. John Sherman, and his cousin, Captain John Sherman. General Sherman was descended from the clergyman, and a certain Roger Sherman, whose name is appended to the declaration of Independence, was descended from the captain. General Sherman was the sixth child of a family of eleven; his brother, the distinguished Senator, sometime Secretary of the Treasury in the Cabinet of President Hayes, and afterwards presiding officer of the Senate, being the eighth. Their mother, whose maiden name was Mary Hoyt, was married to their father in 1810.

Born on 8th February 1820, the young Sherman was entered in 1836 as a cadet at West Point, and in 1840 he graduated sixth in a class of 42. In the same year he was appointed second lieutenant of the 3rd Regiment of Artillery, and was sent with his regiment to Florida, where garrisons were still quartered to maintain the tranquillity of the country at the close of an Indian war. He was promoted to be first lieutenant in 1841, and was for sometime placed in charge of a detachment at Fort Moultrie, in Charleston Harbour. In 1843 he began to study law, without abandoning the army. In 1846, during the war with Mexico, he was sent to California, making the voyage round Cape Horn, and in the course of the war he served as Adjutant-General to several of the Generals employed. His services in California secured his promotion to the rank of brevet captain in 1848, and in 1850 he was married to Ellen Boyle, the daughter of the Hon. Thomas Ewing, at that time Secretary of the Interior. In the same year he was appointed captain in the Commissary Department, and sent in discharge of his duties first to St. Louis and afterwards to New Orleans; but he resigned his commission and quitted the army in 1853, finding that the military life offered little attraction and no prospect in those times to a man of his energetic temperament.

The next few years of the General's life were full of adventure and variety. Having obtained the management of a bank in San Francisco—a branch of the house of Lucas, Turner & Co., of St. Louis—he went for a second time to California, being

now accompanied by his wife. The steamer in which they took passage was wrecked in a fog on the coast north of San Francisco, but the passengers were saved. Taking a passage in a coasting schooner laden with timber, the future General was wrecked for a second time on the same day in a squall at the entrance to San Francisco Bay, and would have been drowned if the vessel had not been kept afloat by her cargo. However, he and his wife got safely to San Francisco, and he entered on his duties as manager of the bank. Those were the days of feverish speculation in consequence of the recent discovery of gold in California, and in one of the numerous financial crises that occurred Sherman's bank narrowly escaped insolvency, being saved only by Sherman's energy, intrepidity, and fertility of resource, when many of its rivals perished. Sherman remained only four years in San Francisco, returning in 1857 to St. Louis, where he obtained the appointment of agent at New York for the firm he had represented at San Francisco. This he held for a short time, until the firm failed through no fault of its own, and he afterwards practised as a lawyer for two years at Leavenworth, in Kansas.

In 1860 he obtained the more congenial appointment of superintendent of the Louisiana Military Academy, at Alexandria, Louisiana, a post which he held with distinction and success until the war had broken out, and the State of Louisiana had resolved to throw in its lot with the Confederate States. Sherman was no politician, and his connection with the Southern States would, so long as the differences between North and South were merely political, probably have enlisted his sympathies rather on the side of the South than that of the North. But the outbreak of hostilities decided him at once. "Recent events," he wrote to the Governor of Louisiana, "foreshadow a great change, and it becomes all men to choose. If Louisiana withdraws from the Federal Union I prefer to maintain my allegiance to the Constitution so long as a fragment of it survives; and my longer stay here would be wrong in every sense of the word."

Sherman was now once more without employment, though he offered himself at once for that employment for which he was best fitted, and in which he was to achieve such brilliant renown—namely, military service. He did not, however, share the illusions which at that time prevailed at Washington as to

the probable suppression of the Southern rebellion in a few weeks, and though he was prepared to accept a commission, and considered that his military experience and services entitled him to claim one, he was not prepared to serve as a private soldier, or to re-enter the army merely as a ninety days' volunteer. For a month or two, not seeing his way clearly, he undertook the post of president of the Fifth-Street Railway in St. Louis, and busied himself with the duties of his office. Shortly afterwards, in April 1861, he was offered the chief-clerkship of the War Department, with the promise of being made Assistant Secretary of War as soon as Congress should meet. He declined the offer, however, as being inconsistent with the obligations he had undertaken, and for a time he fell under the suspicion of some members of Lincoln's Cabinet as being disaffected towards the Union.

But events moved rapidly, and Sherman soon began to see where his duty lay, while the military authorities at Washington, also began to perceive that they would require all the military talent and military experience that the country could furnish in its extremity. In May 1861 Sherman was accordingly offered, and he promptly accepted, the appointment of Colonel of the 13th Regular Infantry, and having repaired to Washington, on his appointment he was placed in command of a brigade in Tyler's division of the army, that marched to Bull Run. In this capacity he took part in that memorable engagement, and though his troops fought well, and his own share in the fight was an honourable and energetic one, he had the mortification of submitting to serious reverse in his first encounter with the enemy. His own comment on the affair is characteristically frank, outspoken, and clear-sighted. "It is now generally admitted," he writes in his Memoirs, "that it was one of the best-planned battles of the war, but one of the worst fought. Our men had been told so often at home that all they had to do was to make a bold appearance, and the rebels would run; and nearly all of us for the first time then heard the sound of cannon and muskets in anger, and saw the bloody scenes common to all battles, with which we were soon to be familiar. We had good organisation, good men, but no cohesion, no real discipline, no respect for authority, no real knowledge of war. Both armies were fairly defeated, and whichever had stood fast, the other would have run. Though the North was

overwhelmed with mortification and shame, the South really had not much to boast of, for in the three or four hours of fighting their organisation was so broken up that they did not and could not follow our army, when it was known to be in a state of disgraceful and causeless flight."

Shortly after Bull Run, Sherman was promoted to the rank of Brigadier-General of Volunteers, and in August he was detached from the Army of the Potomac, and appointed second in command to General Robert Anderson, in Kentucky. In that State political feeling was greatly divided, and the dominant belief among the partisans of the North, both in Kentucky and at Washington, was that the war would soon be over, and that no serious sacrifices were required. This belief was made a pretext for vacillation and supineness, and resulted in a state of affairs with which Sherman, who always took a serious view of the military situation, had no patience. When, in October, he succeeded General Anderson in command, he surprised and irritated his superiors by declaring that 60,000 men would be required to drive the enemy out of the State, and 200,000 to put an end to the struggle in that region. This opinion was confidentially expressed to the Secretary for War, in person, at a Council of War held at Sherman's headquarters. But it was inadvertently made public, and its publication aroused a storm of indignant and ill-informed criticism among those partisans of the North who still fancied that the South was to be speedily and easily vanquished.

Sherman was universally denounced with a curious redundancy of vituperation, as "crazy, insane, and mad," and even his military superiors seem to have thought that the anxieties and responsibilities of his command had temporarily destroyed the balance of his military judgment. Sherman was accordingly superseded in November by General Buell, and, after a short leave of absence, granted, or rather pressed upon him by the War Department, "for the benefit of his health," he was placed in command of a camp of instruction at Benton Barracks, near St. Louis. But his military genius was not long to be thus lightly regarded. In February 1862 he was appointed to the Army of Tennessee, to take command of the Fifth Division. It was this division which bore the brunt of the important battle of two days' duration, at Shiloh or Pittsburg Landing, on the Tennessee River. The battle was indecisive in the field, but it

led to the retirement of the enemy on Corinth, and, this being Grant's object in fighting it, it was properly claimed as a Federal victory. Sherman was wounded in the hand in the first day's engagement, but he never quitted his post, and Grant in his despatches attributed the whole success of the engagement to Sherman's skilful dispositions and "individual efforts."

In Halleck's campaign against Corinth, which immediately followed the battle of Shiloh, Sherman bore an active and distinguished part, being promoted for his services to the rank of Major-General of Volunteers in May 1862; and in the following month, Halleck having in the meantime been appointed General-in-Chief, and Grant made General in Command of the Department of Tennessee, Sherman was sent to Memphis, which had recently been captured, and ordered to provide for the defence of the city.

From this period onwards the biography of Sherman becomes the military history of the war in Tennessee and on the Mississippi, until it is merged into the more general history of the final and victorious campaign which ended in the surrender of Lee and Johnstone, and the conclusion of the war. We can only trace it in briefest outline. Sherman bore a brilliant part in the long operations against Vicksburg, being promoted to the rank of Brigadier-General in the Army, for his effective services rendered to Grant in his final and victorious assault on that city, on 4th July 1863.

In the campaign against Vicksburg the Confederates lost 56,000 men, 32,000 of whom surrendered at Vicksburg itself, while Grant's total loss was under 9,000, but as Sherman himself pointed out in his Memoirs, "The value of the capture of Vicksburg was not measured by the list of prisoners, guns, and small arms, but by the fact that its possession secured the navigation of the great central river of the continent, bisected fatally the Southern Confederacy, and set the armies which had been used in its conquest free for other purposes; and it so happened that the event coincided, as to time, with another great victory which crowned our armies far away at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. That was a defensive battle, whereas our was offensive, in the highest acceptation of the term, and the two, occurring at the same moment of time, should have ended the war." After Vicksburg, Sherman and his troops enjoyed a brief respite from active operations, his troops being encamped along the Big

Black River, to the east of Vicksburg. But in October he was again in the field, having just sustained a grievous personal loss by the death of his little son, Willie, who, with the rest of his family, had joined him while he was encamped on the Big Black. He was ordered to Chattanooga, on the Tennessee River, where Rosecrans was hardly pressed and beleaguered by Bragg, Burnside being in almost equal difficulties at Knoxville, further to the north-east. Thenceforward, until the end of the year, Sherman's troops were incessantly and actively engaged marching and fighting, until Bragg was completely defeated at Chattanooga, and Burnside, relieved by the arrival of Sherman, at Knoxville, on 3rd December, when Knox, who was besieging him, was compelled to retire.

In March 1864, Grant having been made Lieutenant-General in Supreme Command of the Armies of the United States, assigned to Sherman the command of the military division of the Mississippi, including the departments of Ohio, Tennessee, the Cumberland, and Arkansas — that is, the entire south-western region, with headquarters at Nashville. Sherman had already received the thanks of Congress for his brilliant services in the Chattanooga campaign, but he was now destined to render still more brilliant services and to achieve still more decisive results. In April Sherman was ordered by Grant to move against Atlanta. He fixed his headquarters at Chattanooga with 90,000 men and 254 guns, his opponent, Johnston, having 41,000 men, subsequently reinforced to 62,000, well supplied and equipped, and protected by intrenchments and natural obstacles. In spite of determined resistance on the part of the Confederate general, Sherman, with consummate strategy, gradually pushed Johnston back upon Atlanta, fought battle after battle, encountered sortie upon sortie, and, failing to capture the place by direct assault, carried five of his corps to attack the enemy's line of communications, 26 miles south of Atlanta, defeated Hood, who had superseded Johnston at Jonesboro', occupied his sole remaining line of supply, and finally compelled him to evacuate the place on 1st September 1864. This was practically the turning-point of the war, for Hood was compelled to leave the whole of the South at Sherman's mercy, and, turning northwards, he moved upon Nashville, where he was defeated by Thomas, whom Sherman had sent thither to resist his advance.

Writing to Sherman in acknowledgment of his despatches announcing the capture of Atlanta, Grant said, "I feel you have accomplished the most gigantic undertaking given to any general in this war, and with a skill and ability that will be acknowledged in history as unsurpassed, if not unequalled." Nor were the political consequences of Sherman's brilliant campaign less momentous and decisive than its strategical results. The capture of Atlanta contributed largely to the victory of Lincoln in the Presidential election in the autumn over M'Clellan, the candidate of the Democratic party, whose policy was directed towards the conclusion of an immediate peace based on the disruption of the Union.

Sherman had now cleared the obstacles from his path, and resolved to demonstrate the hollowness of the military resistance of the South by his celebrated "march to the sea," from Atlanta to Savannah, his ulterior purpose being to march from Savannah northwards through the Carolinas, and co-operate with Grant, advancing from the north, in a final campaign against the remaining armies of the Confederacy. The military authorities at Washington regarded his plans with grave misgiving, and though Grant approved of them and trusted Sherman implicitly, yet his chief of the staff was very bitterly opposed to them, and finding Grant was not to be persuaded to withhold his approval, he actually appealed, though fortunately without success, to the authorities at Washington to interpose a veto.

Sherman had his way, and the result is a matter of history. His views and purpose in undertaking this celebrated march are best set forth in his own words:—"I only regarded the march from Atlanta to Savannah as a 'shift of base,' as the transfer of a strong army, which had no opponent, and had finished its then work, from the interior to a point on the sea-coast, from which it could achieve other important results. I considered this march as a means to an end, and not as an essential act of war. Still, then as now, the march to the sea was generally regarded as something extraordinary, something anomalous, something out of the usual order of events; whereas, in fact, I simply moved from Atlanta to Savannah as one step in the direction of Richmond, a movement that had to be met and defeated, or the war was necessarily at an end. Were I to express my measure of the relative importance of

the march to the sea, and of that from Savannah northward, I would place the former at one, and the latter at ten, or the *maximum*." Such was Sherman's view, and the issue abundantly justified it. Setting out from Atlanta in November with such of his troops as remained after detaching Thomas against Hood, he threatened Augusta and Macon, deliberately deceiving the enemy in regard to his real intentions. Encountering no serious opposition, he marched steadily onwards across Georgia, and appeared, close to Savannah, before Fort MacAllister, which he captured after a brief engagement on 13th December, and compelled Savannah itself to surrender on 21st December, being thereby enabled to open communications with the United States fleet on the seaboard. His army had marched 300 miles in 24 days, and had found abundant supplies, while it had encountered no effective resistance in the heart of the enemy's territory. In his despatch to Lincoln announcing his arrival on the coast and his capture of Savannah, Sherman wrote :—"I beg to present to you as a Christmas gift the city of Savannah, with 150 heavy guns, plenty of ammunition, and 25,000 bales of cotton." On 10th January 1865 he received the thanks of Congress for his "triumphal march."

The war was now virtually at an end. The power of the Confederate States was broken, and the hollowness of their resistance demonstrated, though a few months were still to elapse before Lee surrendered to Grant and Johnston to Sherman. Sherman had still two more battles to fight before he occupied Goldsboro', in North Carolina, and it was not until April 26, after the capture of Raleigh, that Johnston finally surrendered upon the same terms as had been accorded to the army of Lee. We have seen how Sherman himself estimated the relative strategical importance of his "march to the sea"—a brilliant military achievement and a master-stroke of enterprising strategy on which his popular reputation principally rests—and of his subsequent operations in the Carolinas, which he regarded as the real objects of the whole campaign. But his march to Savannah alone, coinciding as it did in its issue with the final destruction of Hood's army by Thomas—to whom Sherman had in defiance of his critics confidently entrusted the task—was in his own words "an achievement that entitles it to a place in the military history of the world." Sherman possessed in a rare degree that invaluable quality of military insight which

Livy ascribes to Hannibal in the historic words, *bene ausus vana contemnere.* He also possessed a power of broad combination and comprehensive movement which enabled him to look beyond the results of a particular movement to the general issues of a campaign. What is more, he could explain his views, as our readers have seen, in clear, precise, and vigorous language. We will give one more illustration of this in an extract from his Special Field Order issued after the capture of Savannah for the purpose of explaining to his army the objects and results of the campaign.

"We held Atlanta, a city of little value to us, but so important to the enemy that Mr. Davis, the head of the rebellious faction in the South, visited his army near Palmetto and commanded it to regain the place and also to ruin and destroy us by a series of measures which he thought would be effectual. That army, by a rapid march, gained our railroad near Big Shanty, and afterwards about Dalton. We pursued it, but it moved so rapidly that we could not overtake it, and General Hood led his army successfully far over toward Mississippi, in hope to decoy us out of Georgia. But we were not thus to be led away by him, and preferred to lead and control events ourselves. Generals Thomas and Schofield, commanding the departments to our rear, returned to their posts and prepared to decoy General Hood into their meshes, while we came on to complete the original journey. We quietly and deliberately destroyed Atlanta, and all the railroads which the enemy had used to carry on war against us, occupied his State capital, and then captured his commercial capital, which had been so strongly fortified from the sea as to defy approach from that quarter. Almost at the moment of our victorious entry into Savannah came the welcome and expected news that our comrades in Tennessee had also fulfilled, nobly and well, their part, had decoyed General Hood to Nashville, and then turned on him, defeating his army thoroughly, capturing all his artillery, great numbers of prisoners, and were still pursuing the fragments down in Alabama. So complete a success in military operations, extending over half a continent, is an achievement that entitles it to a place in the military history of the world."

In the confusion which followed at Washington on the assassination of President Lincoln, Sherman incurred much undeserved censure in consequence of his having been publicly

represented by Stanton, the Secretary of War, as having offered Johnston terms of surrender which seemed to imply that he was empowered and had undertaken to deal with the political *status* of the Confederate States. These terms were disallowed by the Government at Washington, and Sherman was instructed to negotiate only for the surrender of Johnston's army. The incident led to a serious misunderstanding between Sherman and Stanton, but the two men were subsequently reconciled, and it was not long before Sherman's countrymen acknowledged that the whole affair was due to an unfortunate misconception, and acquitted Sherman of all blame for his share in it.

With the close of the war Sherman's career in the field was ended, though he continued to serve his country in the highest military capacities. From 1865 to 1869 he was in command of the military division of the Mississippi, with his headquarters at St. Louis. He was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-General in 1866, and when Grant was elected President of the United States in 1869, Sherman was appointed to succeed him as General of the army. In 1871 and 1872 he visited Europe and travelled in the East, and was received everywhere with the honours due to his high military rank and his distinguished services in the field. He was retired at his own request from active service in 1884 and resigned his command of the army. He has since lived in a private station at St. Louis, where so much of his life has been spent and so many of his interests have been centred. His death removes one of the greatest heroes of a great war and impoverishes the world's stock of military genius and renown.

PRINCE NAPOLEON

1822-1891

OBITUARY NOTICE, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1891

THE death of Prince Napoleon severs the last of the family ties connecting the present generation with the days of the First Napoleon. It is true the prince was born on the 9th of September 1822, more than a year after his renowned uncle had passed away in his exile at St. Helena. But, at his birth, the shadow of world-ruling glory and ambition had not passed away from his house. He was the son of the youngest brother of the conqueror, Jerome Bonaparte, sometime King of Westphalia, who, at his master's orders, had repudiated his marriage with an American lady, and had taken as his second wife the Princess Royal of Würtemberg. This lady became the mother of Napoleon Joseph Charles Paul, the prince who has just died. Bonapartism soon disappeared, for many a day, from practical politics, and was transmuted into the more dangerous form of legend. The early years of King Jerome's son were lightened by no hopes of a restoration to Royal or Imperial rank, and were spent in wandering through Austria, Italy, Germany, England, and Spain. It was not until shortly before the Revolution of 1848 that the prince, with his father, was allowed to settle in France. Travel, however, and study had not been thrown away upon the young man, whose intellectual powers were recognised by those who distrusted him on the moral side, and with good reason, both as his uncle's nephew and as his father's son. The fall of the Orleans dynasty and the proclamation of the Second Republic found Prince Napoleon ready to take a decided part in public life.

Leaving to his cousin, the future emperor, the task of re-asserting the more especially Imperialist traditions of Bonapartism, he took on himself another character identified with Napoleonic legend. It was not the Napoleon who strove to place himself high above common mortals on the throne of Charlemagne and Louis XIV., to be consecrated, as became the "eldest son of the Church," by the Supreme Pontiff himself, and to surround his military despotism with the gaudy formalism of a Byzantine court, that was, in the eyes of the prince now dead, the model to be imitated in that revolutionary age, but rather the Napoleon who was proud to call himself the "Child of the Revolution," and who, as the armed soldier of democracy, had shattered the old order of things in Europe. This ideal, it must be admitted, Prince Napoleon kept as steadily in view as circumstances permitted, though he was never lucky enough to win confidence either for his policy or for himself. Indeed, his political career was singularly unfortunate, except when events thrust him into prominence without his own co-operation. He was elected to the Constituent Assembly as one of the Republican Deputies from Corsica. Having started by declaring that "the duty of every good citizen was to rally to the Republic," he voted first with the Moderate Republicans, and, after his dismissal from the diplomatic post he had been sent to fill at Madrid, with the Extreme Left. He soon came to be profoundly distrusted by both sections, while, at the same time, he did not conceal his disapproval of the designs of his cousin, the Prince-President, then rapidly qualifying for the daring enterprise of the Second of December.

At the time of the *Coup d'État* Prince Napoleon not only stood aloof, but induced his father to stand aloof, from the makers of the new tyranny. Whether he acted thus from conviction or from prudence, or from both motives combined, his attitude was very annoying to the Prince-President and his confederates, and the offence was not readily forgiven. In France even those who detested the Imperialists looked on Prince Napoleon's conduct with unreasonable suspicion, and incorporated it, perhaps unjustly, into the evidence in support of the popular disbelief in his personal courage. But, as Kinglake has said,

"It was natural that the Prince should be most unwilling to be put to death or otherwise ill-treated upon the theory that he was the cousin, and therefore the accomplice, of Louis, for of

that theory he wholly and utterly denied the truth. Any man, however firm, might well resolve that, happen what might to him, he would struggle hard to avoid being executed by mistake; and it seems unfair to cast blame on Prince Napoleon for trying to disconnect his personal destiny from that of the endangered men at the Élysée whose counsels he had not shared."

Still, the memory of what was treated as a desertion of the head of the family rankled, and it was not till the end of 1852, when the Empire was formally established, that he returned to public life. Napoleon III. then felt the necessity, for social reasons, of gathering some sort of an Imperial family around the new throne. It would not have been possible for Prince Napoleon, had he so desired, to escape his share of this grandeur and responsibility, unless he had been prepared to go again into exile. His name appeared in the Senatus-Consultum regulating the Imperial succession, and, according to the precedent set by the first Emperor, excluding the family of Lucien Bonaparte and placing the children of Jerome next after those of Louis. Prince Napoleon was at once appointed, in virtue of his Imperial rank, a member of the Senate and of the Council of State, a Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour, and, though he had never served in the army, a general of division. It would, perhaps, have been well for him if he had not received his last promotion.

A little more than a year later the diplomatic struggle with Russia ended in war; the Prince took part in the Crimean expedition, and was present at the battle of the Alma. Unfortunately, his division contributed nothing to the victory, and his military conduct was severely handled by the sharp-tongued Parisians. The historian of the Crimean war does not consider that this criticism was fully justified, though it was, in a certain sense, reasonable. Kinglake wrote—

"It is natural enough that a divisional general, whose rank gave him shelter from the ordeal of a fair military investigation, should for that very reason be made to suffer the more bitterly from the stings which men robbed of their freedom are accustomed to plant with the tongue. Resembling the first Emperor in outward looks, Prince Napoleon was also very like his uncle, not apparently in his main objects, but in the character of his intellect; for he had that rare and exceeding clearness of view which man is able to command when he can separate things essential from things of circumstance, and keep

the two sets of thoughts so clean asunder as to be able to go to the solution of his main problem with a mind unclouded by even those details which it is vital for him to master and provide for, though he refuses to let them mix with the elements from which he fetches out his conclusion. And although one cannot help knowing that the most cruel of all the imputations which can be brought against a soldier has long been fastened upon Prince Napoleon, I may say that such knowledge as I have hitherto chanced to gain of his career has not yet enabled me to infer that he is a man of lower grade than his uncle in the matter of personal courage."

This testimony is worth notice, as that of a writer who was present at the battle of the Alma, and who had no love for any of the Bonapartes. But the Prince, with all his ability, was curiously wanting in tact, and on this occasion, as on many others, he took precisely the course most irritating to French feelings. He left the Crimea, where Lord Raglan, Marshal St. Arnaud, and hundreds of officers of both nations were to die, "for reasons of health," and he became at the same time responsible for the publication in Brussels of a pamphlet criticising the policy and strategy of the war. Already obnoxious to the Republicans as one of the Imperial House, he was now even more fiercely attacked by the Imperialists, and both parties strove to confirm the popular belief in his cowardice by labelling him with the opprobrious nickname of Plon-Plon.

The Prince, however, was not to be easily extinguished. Always fond of travel, he judiciously withdrew for a while from the public eye, and, returning to France, saw that, in the absence of a regular Opposition, there was room for the representation of other ideas beside those of the official and clerical hangers-on of the Court, who were believed to possess a tower of strength in the Empress. As the Italian crisis was soon to show, revolutionary and anti-clerical ideas had a lodgment in the mind of the Emperor himself, who, though he never trusted his cousin, was at times much under his influence, and was not sorry to have some indirect means of measuring forces of which the Rouhers and the Haussmanns knew nothing. Prince Napoleon found it profitable politically, as well as consonant with his personal tastes, to keep up an intimacy with men of letters and *libres penseurs*, who were also patronised by his sister, the Princess Mathilde.

In January 1859 the Prince married the Princess Clotilde, the daughter of Victor Emmanuel, then only King of Sardinia. This alliance was generally understood to signify that the Emperor had finally resolved to enter upon an anti-Austrian policy, and, in fact, a couple of months later war was declared. The resurrection of Italy encouraged Prince Napoleon to adopt a more decidedly Liberal policy in France. His speeches in the Senate on the Temporal Power, and in Corsica on the liberalisation of government at home, produced a great sensation. But the Emperor's mind had, for the time, veered round; the Prince was disavowed on the first point and openly rebuked on the second, whereupon he retired from the Council of State, as well as from the presidency of the Commission of the Exhibition of 1867. He had previously presided over that of 1855. But the Emperor was too deeply involved in foreign and domestic troubles to be able to dispense for long with his cousin's advice and aid.

In 1868, when the relations between France and Germany were visibly strained and it was universally felt that war could not be long delayed, the Prince undertook an expedition to Southern Germany, Austria-Hungary, the Balkan Principalities, and Turkey, with the scarcely-disguised design of finding allies for France and remedying the isolation of which he afterwards complained. On his return he is believed to have exerted himself vigorously in favour of the adoption of the system of Ministerial responsibility and Parliamentary government, which was in part conceded in July 1869. During the debates in the Senate in the following month he pleaded for carrying the concessions much further and making a clean sweep of the "old gang," which naturally brought him into angry collision with the "Vice-Emperor," M. Rouher. The tentative movement towards Liberalism under the Ollivier Cabinet only precipitated the contest with Germany and annulled Prince Napoleon's influence. He was not the man to create a reputation for himself during the war, and the Emperor gave him no opportunity of distinguishing himself.

Napoleon III., according to the Prince's statement, sent him on a confidential mission to Victor Emmanuel, his father-in-law, in the hope of inducing the latter to take sides with France. At Florence, then the Italian capital, he received the paralysing news of Sedan, the Emperor's captivity, and the Empire's fall.

He retired at once with his family to his château at Prangins, in Switzerland, and for a time his friends believed that the German Government would support him as a candidate for the Regency, or even as his cousin's immediate successor. Prince Bismarck vehemently disclaimed any project of the kind, which would in any case have been hardly possible without the support of the captive army, or of the new levies of the Republic, or of both. The Prince, however, had not regained his reputation with military men. It had been made a charge against him that he had refused to fight a duel, after an acrimonious interchange of letters, with the Duc d'Aumale in 1861, and M. Jules Favre, ten years later, taunted him with his absence from the critical scenes of the struggle of 1870-1871, as "une personne qui, ayant eu l'honneur de porter l'uniforme de général français, avait tourné le dos au moment où l'ennemi envahissait le territoire." To this taunt Prince Napoleon replied in a pamphlet, "La Verité à mes Calomniateurs," in which he gave his own explanation of his conduct.

His unpopularity in the early days of the Third Republic was shown by the clearest evidence. Yet the Government of M. Thiers plainly feared him, and when, after some abortive attempts to get a political footing in Corsica, he attended a private Bonapartist gathering at Millemont, he was arrested with his wife and summarily expelled from French soil. The overthrow of M. Thiers, effected by a coalition of all the Monarchical parties, put an end to Prince Napoleon's exile; but almost his first public act was to propose an alliance against the "White Flag" among all adherents of democracy, Imperialist and Republican. The latter were not caught by these overtures, while the Monarchists were, of course, indignant. At the same time, the Prince was in open disagreement with the nominal chief of his party, the Prince Imperial, and his advisers.

An electoral campaign followed, in which Prince Napoleon sustained a severe personal check, being defeated at Ajaccio by M. Rouher, in spite of his appeal to the electors to "choose between the son of Jerome, nephew of Napoleon I., and a stranger to our isle." M. Rouher's election, however, was invalidated by the Chamber, and the Prince took his place, distinguishing himself by vehement attacks on the Clericals, which drove the Right frantic, but were coldly received by the Left. In the crisis of 1877—the famous *Seize Mai*—the Prince

was one of the faithful 363 who withstood Marshal MacMahon and the Duc de Broglie. He was rewarded by meeting with no Republican opposition in Ajaccio at the general election, when he was badly beaten, notwithstanding, by Baron Haussmann. He fell away more and more from his party, engaging in sharp polemical attacks on the past policy and present conduct of the surviving Ministers of the Empire.

Such was the position of Prince Napoleon when, through the death of his young cousin in South Africa, he became, in right of his birth and by the provisions of the Senatus-Consultum of 1852, head of the Bonaparte family. He was accepted as such by the main body of the Imperialists, though the "stalwarts" of that party, of whom M. Paul de Cassagnac was the most conspicuous, opposed him, both on the ground of his personal untrustworthiness and on that of the Prince Imperial's will, which designated Prince Victor, Prince Napoleon's eldest son, as the heir to the Imperial pretensions. For some time Prince Napoleon made no effort to act upon public opinion. The split between his adherents and those of his son nullified the strength of Bonapartism, even in districts like the north and the south-west, where that creed has for many years been powerful. At length the prescription of the religious orders in 1880 drew Prince Napoleon, not very fortunately, out of his reserve. He applauded the action of the Republican Government as a vindication of the principles of the Concordat; he denounced the so-called "Union of Conservatives," and declared that he and his followers could never sustain "a retrograde policy opposed to civilisation, to science, and to real liberty."

It is a pity that the consistency of this manifesto should have been marred by another emanating from the same pen, which was placarded by the Prince's orders on the walls of Paris in 1883. In this last he demanded a *plébiscite* as the champion of the Church, and framed, in this unwonted character, a solemn act of accusation against the Republic. After censuring the domestic and foreign policy of the Republic, the legislative schemes and the financial administration of the Government, he rose to a high pitch of indignation when declaring that "religion, attacked by a persecuting atheism, was not protected," though it would have been easy to safeguard "that great interest of every civilised society." For this he was arrested, but the Government found that a prosecution could not be sustained,

and the victory remained with the Prince. It was too late. Prince Napoleon could never reconquer the confidence of the Church, and of those who held by the Church for political or for religious reasons; and without the aid of the Church the Bonapartists were nowhere. In the summer of 1884 the efforts of M. de Cassagnac and his friends were crowned with success, and the rupture between Prince Victor and his father became complete. Prince Napoleon retorted in the following year, when the Monarchists had hopes of winning at the general election, by a manifesto denouncing the renewal of the Conservative alliance; but his protest produced no visible effect. For an instant the Prince emerged from obscurity when in 1886 the Republicans exhibited their want of faith in the fidelity of the people to Republican institutions by passing the Princes Expulsion Bill, in the application of which Prince Napoleon and his son Prince Victor were associated with the Comte de Paris and his son the Duke of Orleans. All that remains of the old Bonapartist feeling—much of it having been absorbed in a half-unconscious acceptance of things as they are, a good deal having been dissipated in the Boulangist effervescence, and some part having been transmuted into Orleanism—has centred for a long time past, not in the father, but in the son. Prince Victor has shown nothing at all approaching to Prince Napoleon's abilities; but he has been to a certain extent a power, while his father had for years before his death ceased to be so. The Boulangist agitation was a touchstone of political capacity, and, tried by this, Prince Napoleon fell short as lamentably as the Comte de Paris, though not in the same way, of the standard that every pretender who means to be anything more must aspire to.

Prince Napoleon, as Kinglake has said, possessed something of his uncle's intellectual power as well as his bodily semblance. But his intellect, powerful as it was, was not weighty enough to turn the balance where moral qualities were absent. Even in the case of the great Napoleon the victory of immoral force was only temporary. It would not be just to say that Prince Napoleon, though he was largely endowed with the cynicism of the founder of his family, was, or perhaps could ever have become, so bad a man, but neither had he in him the same elements of active and creative energy for good or evil. A book published by him within the last two or three years, *Napoléon et ses Détracteurs*, professing to be a reply to the elaborate indict-

ments against the First Emperor put together by M. Lanfrey, Colonel Yung, and M. Taine, is chiefly interesting as throwing a light on his own character. Compared with his uncle, he seems to have possessed no higher moral standard, but then his will and his emotions "were as moonlight unto sunlight and as water unto wine." Nothing more characteristic is recorded of him than his behaviour as the President of the Commission which continued, from 1852 down to 1869, the publication of the *Correspondance de Napoléon I.*, a priceless historical treasure, if bequeathed to posterity in an unadulterated form. The early portion, published under Louis Philippe, was stated to be reproduced without change or suppression. Prince Napoleon treated the second part in a different way, frankly announcing that dynastic and national interests would be taken into account, and that he would only allow to be printed "what the Emperor himself, if he had survived, would have given to the public . . . if it had been his desire to display to posterity his personality and his system."

LORD GRANVILLE

1815–1891

Obituary Notice, Wednesday, April 1, 1891

Granville George Leveson-Gower, second Earl Granville, was born in 1815, the year in which his father was raised to the peerage, when honours earned in the war time were being distributed after the crowning victory of Waterloo. The first Lord Granville, a younger son of the Marquis of Stafford, had been a diplomatist of considerable distinction. In 1804 he had gone to St. Petersburg on a similar mission to that which subsequently was to be confided to his son, and had attended the coronation of Alexander as our Ambassador Extraordinary. In 1836 he was Minister at Paris, and his son, who had been educated at Eton and Oxford, was attached for a time to the legation. But the actual apprenticeship the young man served to regular diplomacy was a short one; and in 1837 he was returned to Parliament as member for Morpeth. Three years afterwards he was appointed to the office of Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs; but he had then little opportunity of gaining official experience, for in a short time the Melbourne Ministry was broken up.

Having lost his seat for Morpeth, in 1841 he came back to the House of Commons as representative for Lichfield, and the clever young aristocrat made himself somewhat conspicuous for the vigour and ability with which he advocated the cause of the Anti-Corn-Law League and the principles of free trade. Five years later, on the death of his father, he took leave of the Commons. To many rising politicians that involuntary exchange has been the death of hopes and the grave of

ambitions. Probably Lord Granville rather gained by it. For not only were his temperament and his talents for debate better suited to the more serene atmosphere of the Upper House, but the change removed him from a sphere where he was overshadowed by rivals who were to share the lead of the Liberal party for many years to come. It is certain, at least, that had he not been in the Peers he would never have been thought of as possible Prime Minister in 1859.

Meanwhile he had been made Master of the Buckhounds. That ornamental post seemed admirably suited to one who, notwithstanding his spirited speeches on free trade, had been chiefly thought of as a graceful courtier and polished man of the world. And there was a very general outcry when, in 1848, Lord John Russell transformed the Master of the Buckhounds into his President of the Board of Trade. Mr. Bright spoke the mind of the manufacturing interest with more than his accustomed bluntness; and Lord John Russell resented with constitutional heat a very far-fetched charge of nepotism. Mr. Bright had the grace to avow afterwards that Lord John's penetration had not been in fault. As a clear-headed and energetic man of business Lord Granville gave proof of those versatile abilities which marked him out a year or two later as Vice-President of the Commission for the International Exhibition. In that capacity his geniality and his business powers won him golden opinions from all conditions of men.

His closer relations with Her Majesty and the Prince Consort confirmed, if they did not originate, the warm personal regard which those illustrious personages always expressed for him; while foreign exhibitors, and especially our French friends, were never weary of praising the unfailing courtesy and the winning polish of manner they were so well fitted to appreciate. Perhaps few things did more to foster the *entente cordiale* which was to exercise so important an influence in European politics than the manner in which Lord Granville represented his country at the *fêtes* offered to the English Commissioners by the Paris Municipality in honour of the Exhibition; and in particular his speech at the banquet of the Hôtel de Ville was overpraised as a triumph of oratory by an audience he flattered by his command of their language.

In 1851, for a short time as usual, he was tantalised by the exercise of real power in the post for which he was marked out

by his training and his tastes. For a few months he was called to the Foreign Office, and he was not to return to it for nearly twenty years. Not many statesmen, indeed, had to practise more incessantly the difficult virtues of patience and self-denial; and the tale of the subordinate or ornamental appointments he successively held is, in fact, the secret history of arrangements and compromises between Lords Palmerston, Aberdeen, Russell, and Clarendon. When he consented to take the place of Lord Palmerston in 1851 we suspect he regarded the appointment rather as a sacrifice to party loyalty than as a gratifying recognition of his claims. He could have had no illusions as to the permanence of the Russell Ministry after its chief had broken with his masterful ally.

The death of Peel had left Palmerston the most prominent of our statesmen, especially in the eyes of foreigners. He had flattered the national pride by his high-handed assertion of the national honour; his famous "*Civis Romanus sum*," which was no idle boast, had passed into a household word; and he had just carried off a grand triumph in the famous Don Pacifico affair. His successes and popularity had somewhat turned his head, and he had asserted his independence of action carelessly and, indeed, aggressively. The Queen had complained repeatedly of despatches that were altered after her approval. Lord John Russell was the last man to care to know himself reduced to a cipher in his own Cabinet, and the cause of offence that broke the back of the camel came when Lord Palmerston overrode the official instructions to our Minister in Paris by hastening to express to the Emperor's representative in London a hearty approval of the *Coup d'État*. Lord Palmerston fell gracefully, and nothing could be in better taste than the moderation with which he accepted the rebukes he had provoked, or his reticence when he might have explained or coloured his conduct. But it was popularly believed that he had been sacrificed to reactionary influences from abroad; and thus Lord Granville succeeded to his office under peculiar difficulties. But his habitual tact stood him in good stead; and he had certainly lost no credit on the resignation of the Ministry.

It was in 1859, as we have said, that the Queen sent for him. Lord Derby had resigned on the carrying of the vote of want of confidence which Lord Hartington had been chosen to move as mouthpiece of the allied Liberals. The choice of a Premier

would obviously have lain between Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell, but it was doubtful whether either would yield to the other; and it was thought that the difficulty might possibly be overcome by going to the Lords for a chief of the Cabinet. Lord John settled the question in a somewhat unexpected fashion. He declined to take office under Lord Granville, but declared himself quite willing to serve under Lord Palmerston. And perhaps Lord Granville was not disappointed at being released from a responsibility which must have weighed heavily on him. As head of the Ministry he must have been driven to choose between the mortifying *rôle* of a *roi fainéant* and an incessant struggle against conflicting forces he could hardly hope to control.

The fact of the Queen's having sent for him on that occasion caused him to be talked of again as a possible Premier on the death of Lord Palmerston. But, with the exception of the chairmanship of the Royal Commission of the Exhibition of 1862 and his appointment to the Lord Wardenship of the Cinque Ports in 1865, his public life continued uneventful till Mr. Gladstone took office in 1868. The new Ministry was rich in intellectual power; the difficulty was to distribute places in an embarrassment of pretensions; and, as Lord Clarendon seemed to have a prescriptive right to the Foreign Office, to Lord Granville was assigned the Colonies. His administration of these was marked by that transfer to Canada of the greater part of the vast dominions of the Hudson's Bay Company, which provoked the revolt in the Red River and made Lord Wolseley's reputation.

But apart from the immediate duties of his department, his position in the Lords taxed all his capabilities in supporting the Irish measures of his chief. He was not a great orator; he never broke out in the brilliant perorations which sway the feelings and confuse the judgment. But he showed a power of lucid arrangement, with a command of hard-headed argument, for which he had hardly as yet received sufficient credit. His imperturbable good humour never failed him, even when his temper must have been sorely tried; and, though his weapons were neither sarcasm nor invective, yet he taught his opponents that on occasion he could be a dangerous enemy. A quick thrust, and the sparkling rapier would pierce to the very marrow, if it left nothing behind it to rankle in the wound.

Then, as often afterwards, he showed that strong practical sense which was a conspicuous feature of his intellect. A measure might be unwelcome and lend itself to damaging criticism, but the question was whether circumstances and the changes in them had not made something of the kind unavoidable. If so, it was mere waste of breath disputing upon things as they possibly might have been; while speculating on remote contingencies was hardly less unprofitable. So he would often argue earnestly and conscientiously for measures, as he had often to develop and defend systems of policy, for which in the abstract he had little liking.

In 1869 it fell to him to move in the Lords the second reading of the Irish Church Bill. Seldom had he greater occasion for the display of adroitness, self-control, and conciliatory temper. There was a strong feeling that the English Church was being menaced indirectly through the Irish Establishment; that the measure was subversive of vested rights, and a beginning of the letting out of waters. Lord Granville maintained that the Bill must be judged on its merits and its necessities. Happily, the abuses of the Irish Church system were altogether exceptional. The leader of the Liberal minority appealed to the House on much the same grounds which influenced Lord Salisbury when he recommended his followers not to divide against the more revolutionary Land Bill of 1881. Free and powerful as the House of Lords undoubtedly was, there was one thing than which it was less powerful, and that was the clear expression of the national will. He wound up with an earnest and unusually impassioned appeal to his hearers to look at the question as if Ireland were the stronger and England the weaker and oppressed country. In 1870 he adopted very similar tactics and arguments in introducing the Land Bill.

It was in that year, on the death of Lord Clarendon, that he went to the Foreign Office, to lie on anything but a bed of roses. The outbreak of the Franco-German War had upset the balance of power in Europe; and both belligerents were savagely sensitive to those "infractions of neutrality" which demonstrated our impartiality. He had been assured by the permanent officials in the department, on becoming Foreign Secretary, that the world had never been more profoundly at peace. The halcyon calm was ruffled immediately. The first

burning question that was broached was that of the neutrality of Belgium. Mr. Gladstone, *more suo*, provoked irritation and awakened uneasiness by the reserve of his attitude in the House of Commons. Probably Lord Granville remonstrated; certainly he spoke out manfully and decidedly in the Upper House. He said "the Government knew their duty and were resolved to abide by the position they had taken up."

The upshot was that new tripartite treaty by which England, France, and Prussia undertook to maintain the quintuple engagement of 1839 — with those obligations which subsequently gave occasion for the subtle interpretation of Lord Derby. Next, Russia seized on the opportunity of the war to announce her intention of withdrawing from her engagements as to the Black Sea. She scarcely troubled herself over the impossible task of finding a decent pretext for the repudiation. She had judged, and judged rightly, that England would not go to war alone. Lord Granville's original despatch on the subject was of course unanswerable. As he put it simply, no single party to a contract can withdraw without the assent of the rest. But the real question was felt to be whether Russia had secured the complicity of Prussia. Mr. Odo Russell was sent to Versailles to try and find out. It became clear that Bismarck, while declaring that he had not sanctioned the step, had no intention of breaking with Russia in any case; but, on the assumption that England would not fight, he suggested a conference of the Powers as a graceful way out of the difficulty. Lord Granville was forced to admit, as *raison d'être* of the conference, that the abrogation of a solemn treaty might be an open question. By way of soothing our national susceptibilities an ingenious protocol was devised, which solemnly stated the indisputable fact that no State could release itself from engagements without the consent of the parties to which it was pledged. So the conference formally met to register a foregone conclusion, and knock off the fetters that chafed the Czar.

It must have been mortifying to the high spirit of Lord Granville when he had really to swallow his own words, and withdraw from his impregnable attitude as champion of international morals. He had more success in his correspondence with Count Bernstorff, who had remonstrated against the malevolence of our neutrality; and his powerful State papers

were admitted to be masterpieces in that delicate style of composition. On the other hand, he had to meet the proposals of the French Government of National Defence, that England should interpose between the belligerents as mediator, on the basis of the neutrality of French territory. To any one but a beaten and desperate combatant, casting about for a chance of escape from the worst consequences of the struggle, any scheme of the kind was obviously impracticable. England could only mediate by consent of both parties—a consent which Germany would never give; and M. Chaudordy's proposition really meant that England should interfere actively as an ally. While Lord Granville intimated as much in courteous language, he did all that lay in his power to bring Count Bismarck and M. Thiers together, hoping that something might be gained for France by the eloquence of the veteran statesman. He appealed repeatedly against the bombardment of Paris, and exerted himself to arrange the terms of an armistice. And at home, as abroad, throughout the embittered struggle he occupied the invidious position of having to defend his consistent neutrality against fervent sympathisers with the conquerors and the conquered.

The feeling in England, from the first, had run decidedly in favour of the Germans; and the French Emperor was generally blamed for wantonly rushing on his fate. The French, smarting from their losses, sufferings, and humiliations, keenly felt our want of sympathy; and Lord Granville had to answer the unreasonable appeals of men who maintained that, by upsetting a Government, they had purged themselves from responsibility for the misfortunes it had courted. Nor were they the more ready to forgive him, that he had borne a leading part in the benevolent arrangements for revictualling Paris, and that he had previously instructed the members of our French Legation to do all in their power for the assistance of refugees.

In 1872 his diplomatic ability was again tried to the utmost. A new commercial treaty was to be negotiated with Frenchmen who were anything but kindly disposed towards us; while our long-pending disputes with the victorious Americans were brought up for adjustment by international arbitration. The language in which the American "case" was stated set all precedents of international civility at defiance. The bitterness

with which Mr. Sumner had agitated the claims seemed to have inspired the formal statement of them. Nor was it merely the tone of the representatives of the United States that was offensive. The temper in which they approached the question was even more conclusively shown, by the demand for damages said to have been indirectly incurred by the launch of the *Alabama* and her consorts, which included, with the loss to the shipping interests, pretty nearly the whole expenses of the war, and was estimated vaguely at from 300 to 400 millions sterling. The insolence and the wild extravagance of the American bill of costs roused the indignation of the British nation.

No Ministry that did not peremptorily reject a claim so preposterous could have retained its popularity for a week ; yet, on the other hand, it was admitted by most calm-thinking men that the Americans had a legitimate grievance, and the Ministry had determined that, if possible, it must be redressed. In fact, the offensive conduct of the negotiations was a strong reason for removing the root of bitterness that must have been at the bottom of it. Lord Granville felt this, and fully justified his character for firmness blended with flexibility. With bland decision, he never wavered in his refusal to admit the indirect claims ; but at the same time he gave convincing proofs of the sincerity of his desire to see all differences amicably settled. The British agent was instructed to take no part in the proceedings till those indirect claims were categorically abandoned. But when that was done the arbitration went forward, under conditions made transparently favourable to the Americans ; since it could only be found that liability attached to us by inventing the famous retrospective rules. Lord Chief-Justice Cockburn, in a masterly document, exposed the fallacies which in his opinion had influenced the tribunal, and its decision was received in England with mortification, if not disapproval.

All that can be said is that, as with the renunciation of the Black Sea Clauses, it was a case in which we had to make the best of an unfortunate dilemma, sacrificing for the sake of peace and goodwill something that almost touched the national honour. Lord Granville had the habit of such ungrateful and disagreeable tasks, and he evinced his patriotism by charging himself with a duty which no other of his colleagues could

have performed as efficiently. So, in the following year we find him expostulating with Russia as to her advances in Central Asia. Count Schouvaloff was intrusted by his master with a special mission, and the envoy, with many fair words, assured us that the armies of the Czar, after chastising the Khivans, would definitely evacute the troublesome Khanate. Of very similar value, as it proved, was the assurance given by Prince Gortchakoff that Russia would thenceforth abstain from interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. But, if the Russians proved false to their word, our Foreign Minister cannot be held responsible. He was forced to profess himself satisfied with their solemn promises when it was impossible to exact substantial guarantees.

In 1874, disgusted by the succession of electoral defeats that had culminated in the Stroud election, Mr. Gladstone startled the country with the announcement of a dissolution. In spite of the proffered bribe, in the shape of the abolition of the income-tax, the answer of the constituencies was decisive. It was in a letter to Lord Granville that the lately all-powerful Premier announced his probable retirement from public life, intimating that he might possibly "divest himself of all the responsibilities of leadership at no distant time"; and that he should only occasionally attend the House of Commons. When the Liberals, left leaderless by the defection of their great chief, chose Lord Hartington to fill his place in the House of Commons, naturally an increased share of responsibility devolved on Lord Granville in the Lords. As critic of a foreign policy which he could not control, he vindicated the consistency of his earlier political life by still setting necessity or expediency before dignity when it seemed that standing on our dignity might cost us too dear. The position he took up in the debate on the Berlin Memorandum illustrates our meaning. "The three Emperors" had come to a decision on their line of conduct towards Turkey, unceremoniously inviting the assent of the Western Powers by telegraph.

Lord Granville, had he been Foreign Minister, would have assented for England, believing that the concert of all the Powers would have assured peace in the meantime. He would not have scrutinised the procedure of the Emperors too closely. Their attitude towards Turkey might have been high-handed; but then the end would have justified the means, as he put it

familiarly—if a peaceable individual interferes with a drunken man, undoubtedly there will be a row. If six policemen come up, the drunken man knocks under. But the Conservative Cabinet judged the situation differently, or rather they took a broader view, that embraced the future with the risks to us that might arise out of mischievous precedents. Lord Beaconsfield made it a question of the national honour. England had been slighted, and was bound to mark her sense of the slight, under pain of having to fight sooner or later for her prestige, while Lord Derby, with his habitual caution, suspected secret understandings to which we might stand rashly committed. And the behaviour of the three statesmen on that important occasion was eminently characteristic of each of them. Lord Beaconsfield's much-abused Imperial policy was the outcome of a forethought which perhaps gave excessive regard to the England of the future, and which may have troubled itself over superfluous precautions against contingencies which might never occur, while Lord Granville was more disposed to live through the day and to leave the morrow to take care of itself.

On the springing of the grand surprise on Lord Beaconsfield's last ministry, Lord Granville was again sent for to consult with the Queen. But, in fact, the nation had spoken with an unmistakable voice. The great majority was Mr. Gladstone's own, and none but Mr. Gladstone could be the coming Premier. Lord Granville went back to the Foreign Office, where his place was by no means a sinecure, though his services to the European concert, which secured the cession of territory to Montenegro and Greece, were more unobtrusive than conspicuous. Man proposes, but God disposes. Mr. Gladstone had congratulated the country on the prosperity of Ireland, all things considered. Radical Irish legislation, as we know on the authority of the Duke of Argyll, had never been contemplated by the Liberal Cabinet; yet the attention of the country was to be engrossed by a vital home question, and the Session of 1881 was monopolised by the Irish Land Bill.

Owing to an unseasonable attack of illness, Lord Granville was absent from the discussion of that momentous measure on its second reading in the Lords; and when it was so searchingly analysed by well-informed critics the Government could ill spare one of its ablest speakers. He had shown immediately before his accustomed ability in his correspondence on the

Tunis affair. Setting forth in explicit language the interests of England in the Mediterranean and his determination to maintain them, he elicited assurances from M. Barthélémy St. Hilaire which, so far as words go, left nothing to desire. He could do no more in the meantime than assure us of "moral sympathy" in the unfortunate event of future complications.

However good-tempered and adroit Lord Granville showed himself as leader of the House of Lords throughout the period of Mr. Gladstone's second administration, he was doomed to be less happy in the proper business of his department. Though bred in the purple of diplomacy, and possessing a wide and intimate knowledge of Continental statesmen and their policies, Lord Granville was always rather supple than strong, and his French connections and tastes drew him—no doubt, quite unconsciously—into a sort of opposition, too feebly and spasmodically manifested to have any potent and permanent effect, towards Prince Bismarck's system. It was his ill-fortune that, after he came into office with his chief as representative of a purely domestic policy, repeating the old watchwords of peace, retrenchment, and reform, circumstances brought him face to face, in rapid succession, with a series of diplomatic difficulties in every quarter of the globe, for which neither his stock of rather old-fashioned maxims nor his experience in years of prosperous tranquillity made him a match.

To tell at length the story of Lord Granville's administration at the Foreign Office, between 1880 and 1885, would be to recapitulate the external history of the Empire during a period of extraordinary disturbance and alarm. The Treaty of Berlin proved to be a more stable arrangement than Lord Beaconsfield's critics were willing to admit, as has been proved by the fact that, with slight modifications, it has secured for nearly thirteen years the *status quo* in Europe. Still the preceding storm left a ground-swell behind it, with which Lord Granville had to deal, though this was the least part of his task. When the Porte had been compelled by the Dulcigno demonstration to fulfil its immediate obligations, France began to make her power felt in Northern Africa, and, after her acquisition of a dominating authority over Tunis had been substantially recognised, there was no more to be said, except to register a somewhat tardy resolution that in the future the interests of the British Empire would be watchfully safeguarded.

Lord Granville, it must not be forgotten, was popularly identified with the system of neglecting and disparaging the Imperial relations with the colonies, and he was credited, rightly or wrongly, with the responsibility for the surrender to the victorious Boers after the Majuba Hill disaster. In this condition of feeling, which was not confined to the United Kingdom, may be found the explanation of the long hesitations and the sudden resolves, the vacillating movements and the ambiguous explanations, which make the confused record of the Egyptian difficulty during four eventful years a problem that will puzzle the historians of the twentieth century. In 1882, at anyrate, the Egyptian question was sprung upon a perplexed Cabinet, not wholly united on the subject, if rumour may be trusted, and Lord Granville was confronted with the changing developments of the problem that led, certainly by no reasoned process, to the Joint Note, the bombardment of Alexandria, the campaign of Tel-el-Kebir, the restoration of the Khedive, under British direction and tutelage, and Lord Dufferin's famous despatch. These breathless sensations, into which a Ministry, hampered with the peace pledges of 1880, had been plunged, and in which they had parted company with Mr. Bright, seemed to have passed away for the moment.

But no sooner had order been re-established at Cairo than Lord Granville was beset by two spectres, which pursued him to the close of his term of office—the Suez Canal controversy and the Soudan imbroglio. Lord Granville's efforts to cope with these multiplied embarrassments were signalised rather by good intentions than by practical tact. The Convention for the management of the Canal, provisionally concluded in 1883, had to be dropped, in view of the vehement resistance of the British shipowners, who contended that it would place the commercial and political interests of this country at the mercy of France and M. de Lesseps. If the plan had been persisted in a Parliamentary defeat would have been almost inevitable, and in the then state of home politics that was a danger to be avoided at all hazards. So it was with the question of the Soudan. After the destruction of Hicks Pasha's army and the defeat of Baker Pasha, another Parliamentary crisis was avoided for the moment by sending General Gordon to Khartoum. But the ambiguity of this mission, qualified by later messages to Gordon from the Foreign Office, was destined to

leave the brand of "indelible disgrace," for which, indeed, Lord Granville himself was probably in a very slight degree responsible, on the foreign policy of the ministry. Still less had he any personal responsibility for the delays to which it was due that the expedition up the Nile, after heroic efforts, arrived at Khartoum just too late to save the hero who had devoted his life for the honour of his country and the cause of humanity.

Nevertheless, it is always injurious to the credit of a statesman to be associated with a succession of failures, and Lord Granville's management of the Egyptian question all round inspired little confidence at home, and was treated with insolent contempt abroad. An open breach occurred with France on the subject of a temporary reduction of the interest on the Debt; while, at the same time, Prince Bismarck, who had watched Lord Granville's policy with unconcealed dislike, began to cause trouble in Africa, where the British Foreign Office had temporised rather foolishly with German pretensions and evaded a plain settlement, and had also entered into an unwise agreement giving up the Lower Congo to the Portuguese, now so difficult to deal with on the Zambesi. The result was not only that we had to yield to German pressure at Angra Pequeña and the Cameroons, but that a conference of the Powers was convoked at Berlin to settle the future conditions of the "scramble for Africa." But for this the question of "spheres of influence" would never have grown to its present importance, and England would have stood practically alone as the civilising power in the "Dark Continent." It was not only in Africa that the action—or rather the inaction—of the Foreign Office jeopardised British interests. The colonists of Australasia were frantic on discovering that the representatives of the mother country had allowed Germany to establish formidable pretensions in New Guinea, and France to assert herself in a highly unpleasant way in the South Pacific. They failed to recognise the force of Lord Granville's ingenuous apology that the British Government was "quite unprepared" for the practical assertion of claims which, by diplomatic *laches*, had taken a character of substantial reality.

The discontent with the policy of the Foreign Office had assumed very serious proportions at home as well as in the colonies, even before the Russian crisis of 1885, in which it

was seen once more that our diplomacy had been hoodwinked and over-reached. The Foreign Office had again been taken "quite unprepared," and the Penjdeh surprise, which nearly precipitated a war and gave Mr. Childers the opportunity of bringing forward his "hundred million" budget, was set down with all the rest to the credit, or rather discredit, of Lord Granville. When a division on a small financial point, believed to be not altogether accidental, opened a way for the retreat of the Gladstone Cabinet, in time to prepare for the general election, and to let the memory of their failures subside, no one, probably, hailed the release with more delight than the Foreign Secretary.

During all these perplexities, Lord Granville had led his party in the House of Lords with imperturbable temper, unfailing tact, and ever-ready wit. His geniality and conciliatory disposition had helped to tide over the conflict between the two Houses which seemed to be rendered inevitable by the party strife over the Reform and Redistribution Bills. He retained his position as leader in the Lords to the close of his life. But it was shorn by circumstances of even its moderate authority and distinction. When Mr. Gladstone returned to office as a Home Ruler he was followed by Lord Granville in his rapid conversion, but he did not replace Lord Granville in the Foreign Office, which he assigned to Lord Rosebery, a statesman of a younger generation imbued with Imperialist ideas. Lord Granville took, for the second time, the Colonial Office, an easier post for a public man well stricken in years, and, though he was not a *persona grata* to the colonists, his brief administration led to no difficulties. In the House of Lords, thenceforward, he found himself, whether as leader of the Ministerialists or of the Opposition, in command of a scanty and depressed following, for the ablest statesmen identified with Liberal policy had ranged themselves on the Unionist side. His spirit never flagged, his temper rarely showed signs of friction, but his task was a hopeless one. He ceased more and more to take a conspicuous part in politics, and for some time past the increasing infirmities of age afforded too manifest a justification for his silence or his absence.

Lord Granville was twice married—in 1840, to Maria Louisa, only child and heiress of Emeric Joseph, Duc de Dalberg, and widow of Sir Ferdinand Acton, whom he lost in

1860; and again, five years afterwards, to the youngest daughter of Mr. Campbell, of Islay, who survives him. He is succeeded by his son Granville George, Lord Leveson, who was born in 1872. Besides his political offices and his connection with the Exhibitions of 1851 and 1862, Lord Granville had gone in 1856 to St. Petersburg as Ambassador Extraordinary at the coronation of the Czar; and in the same year he had been elected to the Chancellorship of London University. He was made a K.G. in 1857.

FIELD-MARSHAL VON MOLTKE

1801–1891

OBITUARY NOTICE,
SATURDAY AND MONDAY, APRIL 25 AND 27, 1891

A GREAT soldier has passed away. A foremost name has faded from contemporary history. The genius and skill of Moltke became apparent to the world only when he was sixty-six years old, for he was born in the first year of this century, and has thus lived on into his ninety-first year. His was a long, patient, and silent career of toil and of duty before suddenly his fame burst forth and the excellence of his labour was made manifest. Peace, hardly ruffled, save by the campaign in the Elbe duchies, had been the fortune of Prussia for fifty years since Blucher, in hot pursuit, hurled out of Belgium the columns of the first Napoleon after their repulse at Waterloo. Scarcely an officer serving the House of Hohenzollern had seen blood spilt in battle or a shot fired in anger. The public opinion of Europe did not accord to the Prussian Army the renown which it had fairly won on the field of Mont St. Jean. In this country popular literature and biassed authors till quite within recent years gave the whole credit of that victory to the soldiery of Wellington. By the middle of this century the army of France had talked itself into the first place in European opinion as a military force, and had to a certain degree justified its assertions by some successes against Arab tribes in Algeria. Men at large, judging as usual from assumption rather than experience, and out of ignorance which from being nearly universal becomes vulgarly regarded as knowledge, looked with contemptuous indifference alike on the leaders and soldiery of Prussia. But while Thiers bragged of Gallic glory, and Leech laughed at the levies of

Rhineland, Moltke and Roon studied and toiled, and the military machine which the former was so deftly to handle was fashioned with symmetry and power.

The startling victory of Königgrätz in 1866 surprised the world and woke it to the fact that one of the greatest strategists known to history was chief of the Prussian General Staff. Count Moltke had counselled King William to order the dispositions which allowed the three armies of the Crown Prince, Prince Frederick Charles, and Herwarth to strike a concentrated and crushing blow against the Austrian forces on the Upper Elbe. The war had endured but a few days. It was only on the morning of the 16th of June that the first Prussian corps stepped across the Saxon frontier, and war became inevitable. On the evening of the 3rd of July the shattered battalions of Austria were hurrying in disordered flight along rain-sodden tracks to seek shelter under the guns of Olmütz. This sudden victory practically concluded the war between Austria and Prussia. The prize won was the unity of North Germany ; and on that day the foundation-stone was laid of the modern German Empire. The military plans which led to this rapid and brilliant success were confessedly due to the inspiration of Moltke, and when the Emperor William I. some years later received the Crown of all Germany, his early thought was publicly and officially to thank the strategist to whom so much was due.

The war of 1866 made Count Moltke famous. This fame was won through hard work, constant perseverance, and rigid self-denial. Officers of every army can take no brighter example as their model than Helmuth Karl Bernhard von Moltke. He was born on the 26th of October 1800, at Parchim, in Mecklenburg. His parents were of good family, but poor, and he was their third son. His father, who had been a captain in the Prussian service, in 1801 inherited the family estate in Mecklenburg, but sold it in 1803 and retired to Lübeck. Here, at the early age of six, the boy had an unpleasant experience of war. Blucher, with the few broken remains of the Prussian army which escaped from Jena, threw himself into Lübeck. The French stormed the town on the 9th of November 1806, and the house of Baron Moltke was plundered by the enemy.

Possibly on account of the losses due to the war, Baron Moltke resolved to return to military service. The Prussian

army was almost annihilated, but he sought a commission in the service of Denmark, and subsequently rose in the Danish army to the rank of Lieutenant-General. When nine years old, young Helmuth was sent to school near Kiel, where he made rapid progress under a kind master, the Pastor Knickbein. Thirty years afterwards Moltke still remembered his first teacher with gratitude. He sent him his volume of letters from Turkey, and wrote on the first page, "To my dear teacher and fatherly friend to whom I owe so much, I send this my first work, as a slight testimony of respect." He and his brother were, in 1811, sent to Copenhagen, and in the following year were admitted as cadets into the Royal Military Academy there. This stage of his education was not so happy. He was treated with harshness, and in later years recorded this portion of his life in these words:—"Our boyhood in a foreign city, without relations or friends, was truly miserable. The discipline was strict, even severe; and now, when my judgment of it is quite impartial, I must say it was too strict, too severe."

In the beginning of 1818 young Moltke passed his examination for his commission as best of the candidates. By the rules of the Danish service he was obliged to serve for a year as a Royal page, and in March 1819 was appointed lieutenant in the Oldenburg Regiment, which was then stationed at Rendsburg. He quickly won the respect and esteem of his commander and his comrades by his careful attention to duty, and his modest and kindly disposition. He was chiefly, however, distinguished by a burning desire for knowledge, and an untiring energy for work. His means were small. He had no income beyond his pay, for his father had a large family, and his uncle, after whom he was named, had been killed, as a Mecklenburg captain, in the French army, at the passage of the Beresina, in 1812.

Promotion was slow in the Danish service. Norway had been severed from the arms of Denmark, and the Danish army had to be reduced. The Prussian army had gained renown on the Continent by its gallant action in the war of liberation and the campaign of the hundred days. Moltke determined to transfer himself to Prussia. He obtained leave from his colonel, went to Berlin, passed a brilliant examination for the rank of officer, and at the age of twenty-two became second lieutenant in the 8th Infantry Regiment, then quartered at Frankfort-on-Main. In the following year he joined the Staff

College at Berlin, and after three years of study there passed an excellent examination on leaving. He returned for a short time to his regiment at Frankfort, but in the following year was detached from regimental duty to staff employment, and never did regimental duty afterwards. It is noteworthy how little regimental duty was done by either of the three great strategists of this century—Napoleon, Wellington, or Moltke. Moltke was first appointed to the Topographical Department, and took part in the surveys of Silesia and Posen.

About this time it would appear that he became an author, as a pamphlet appeared at Berlin, which is little known, but which bore the title "*Holland and Belgium*, by H. von Moltke." In this the attention of Europe was called to the Belgian Revolution, and the severance, through the support of France, of Belgium from the kingdom of the Netherlands. In 1832 he was appointed to the General Staff; the next year he became a lieutenant, and was at thirty-five years of age a captain. He had already tasted of the tree of knowledge of foreign travel by a journey to Italy in 1834, when he inspected Genoa and brought back much valuable information. In 1835 he obtained longer leave, and then began the part of his life spent in the East.

He lived in the dominions of the Sultan for more than three years. Although Eastern life, with its luxury of sight, of sound, and of perfume, charmed him, he missed the converse with thoughtful minds that he had enjoyed in his fatherland. In one of his letters, written more than thirty years ago, he describes the decadence that he saw around him and the reasons for it. He speaks of the fear with which the European Powers will see Turkey pass away, and prophesies that in later times the great Eastern problem will be brought to issue under the walls of Constantinople. In 1839 war broke out between the Sultan Mahmud the Second and Mehemet Ali, Viceroy of Egypt, who claimed the right to name his successor. The army of the Sultan was little ready for war, but the Porte appreciated the military talent of Moltke, who was staying as a guest at Constantinople. He and his companion Mühlbach were sent as military advisers to the headquarters of Hafiz Pasha, in the Valley of the Euphrates, near Kharput. In April 1839 the Turkish army, 70,000 strong, commenced its advance towards Syria. It was divided into three corps, but consisted chiefly of recruits, and was speedily reduced by sickness and desertion.

The Egyptian army was at Aleppo under Ibrahim Pasha. In this advance Moltke commanded the Turkish artillery. In vain Moltke pointed out how unprepared for an active campaign was the Turkish army. The Mollahs insisted on offensive operations.

Consequently, on the 22nd, Moltke resigned his post as counsellor of the Commander-in-chief. On the 24th, Ibrahim Pasha attacked the Turkish position, the army fled and dispersed, although it had lost only 1000, and Hafiz Pasha himself only escaped with difficulty. Moltke and his German comrades then returned to Constantinople. There he found the Sultan dead, and his successor, Abdul Medjid, a weak boy of sixteen. The Capudan Pasha had surrendered the Turkish fleet to the enemy, so that Constantinople was exposed to the attack of Mehemet Ali both by sea and land. Great Britain, France, Prussia, and Austria, in the fear that the Porte might fall back for help on Russia, determined to step in and settle the dispute between the Sultan and the Viceroy. Moltke then returned to Berlin, where he was again occupied on the General Staff, and for his services in the Egypto-Turkish campaign received the Prussian order "Pour le Mérite." In the following year, 1840, he was removed from Berlin to the Staff of the Fourth Corps d'Armée at Magdeburg. Here, in the following year, he published his well-known work, *Letters from Turkey*, 1835-39. He also drew and issued some valuable maps, the materials for which he had collected in the East, of the Bosphorus, Constantinople, and Asia Minor.

The letters from Turkey, when first written, before they were made public, had been addressed to one of his sisters, who was married to an English gentleman named Burt, then resident in Holstein. Mrs. Burt had a step-daughter on whom this correspondence made an impression which ripened into affection when Captain Moltke, after his return, was a visitor in her father's house. They were soon engaged, and Moltke was married to his English step-niece in April 1842, a few days after he had been made a major. The marriage proved most happy, and for a quarter of a century Moltke's domestic life was unruffled by any trouble. While quartered at Magdeburg, Major von Moltke wrote an important critical military work, to which many were indebted during the campaign of 1877-78, between Russia and Turkey. It was called *The Russo-Turkish*

Campaign of 1828-29 *in European Turkey*, and is one of the most careful and most able military criticisms which have ever been written. It was published in 1845, and made a great impression in Germany.

In 1845 Moltke was appointed aide-de-camp to Prince Henry of Prussia, an invalid uncle of the king, who lived chiefly in Rome. During his residence there he made many valuable plans of the city and the Campagna. In the following year Prince Henry died, six weeks after his friend Pope Gregory XVI., and hardly had Pius IX. assumed the tiara before Moltke left the Eternal City to carry the report of the Prince's death to the King of Prussia. He returned to Rome again for a short time and accompanied the body in a Prussian man-of-war as far as Gibraltar, where he left the ship to travel to Hamburg by land and prepare for the arrival in Germany. This gave the much-desired opportunity to see Cadiz, Seville, Cordova, Madrid, and France. After his last duties to Prince Henry were accomplished, Moltke was appointed to the staff of the Eighth Corps d'Armée, stationed at Coblentz. Here he remained for two years, then was brought to Berlin as head of a department of the General Staff, but was quickly moved again to be Chief of the Staff of the Fourth Corps d'Armée at Magdeburg. Here he remained till 1855, being promoted in 1850 to the rank of lieutenant-colonel, and in the following year to that of full colonel. Then he was selected to fill the important post of first aide-de-camp to Prince Frederick William of Prussia, afterwards the Emperor Frederick. In 1856 he became a Major-General.

Shortly afterwards the Prince undertook a journey to Russia to represent the House of Hohenzollern at the coronation of the Emperor Alexander II. at Moscow. During this journey Moltke wrote letters in the form of a diary to his wife, which afterwards, through some indiscretion which has not been cleared up, appeared in a Danish newspaper, and later, by the permission of the author, in the *Rundschau*, and in the form of a pamphlet. These have been translated into English by Miss Napier. They not only describe the scenes of court life, which his attendance on the Prince gave him every opportunity of witnessing, but also give a picturesque account of the people, the country, and the army, from the pen of a remarkably attentive and intelligent observer.

In 1856 Moltke accompanied the Prince to England; again,

in 1858, he was present at the marriage of the Princess Royal; and again, in 1867, he visited our island on a very mournful occasion. In returning, a visit was paid in France to the Court of Napoleon III., and in his letters Moltke describes the reception of the Prince by the Emperor of the French, and how beautiful, witty, and fascinating he found the Empress. He speaks of the difficulties of governing the French nation, and says, "It would be as impossible to allow the liberty of the press in France as to admit discussion of the orders given by generals to their armies when in the field."

On leaving France with the Crown Prince, Moltke passed through Saverne. He remembered how, a hundred and seventy-five years before, Louis XIV. had made the same journey, when he wished to show himself as Sovereign to the town of Strasburg, which Louvois, his Minister of War, had just annexed for him. As Louis passed through the country, beautiful with all its autumn colours, he exclaimed, "*Ah! quel beau jardin!*" Moltke passed through Saverne in December, and in its winter clothing saw the "beautiful garden" that had rejoiced the heart of the French King. "How sad it is," he wrote, "to hear these people speaking German, and yet to find them good Frenchmen. We left them in the lurch." Perhaps, even in 1856, Moltke thought to himself that what the weakness of the House of Hapsburg had lost might be regained by the might of the family of Hohenzollern.

In 1856 Prince Frederick William was appointed Colonel of the Second Silesian Regiment, and, when not travelling, lived with his Staff chiefly at Breslau. In the following year the Prince was made Commander of the First Brigade of Guards. A few days later General Reyher, the chief of the staff of the army, died, and shortly afterwards Moltke, one of the youngest general officers in the service, was temporarily entrusted with the duties, and in May 1859 was made Permanent Chief of the Staff, with the rank of Lieutenant-General. Moltke thus rose to the post in the Prussian army which under the great Frederick had been held by Schmettau and Levin; after Jena, by Scharnhorst; and in the war of liberation by Gneisenau, and on his death by Müffling. Great were these names, but Germany regards now Moltke as greatest of them all.

The duty of the chief of a staff is, above all things, to prepare in peace for war. He must consider and regulate the

measures for the mobilisation of the army down to the most minute detail, the plan of operations, and the means of concentration. He must have a thorough knowledge of his own and of foreign armies, and be intimately acquainted with railways, roads, and bridges. Under the administration of Moltke, the Prussian Army became rapidly more ready for war in every particular. Its mobilisation, which on his accession to office was calculated to require twenty-one days, can now be effected in ten days. Moltke had not long to wait before his services were called into active play. On account of the advance of the French Army through Lombardy in 1859 towards German soil the Prussian Army was mobilised, and he drew up the regulations for the advance of the Prussian Army and its railway transport to the Rhine. The manner in which he accomplished this then original task showed the Government and the Army that a wise step had been taken in placing him in the most responsible military position in the country. The carriage of the Prussian troops to the Rhine was to commence on 15th July 1859, and had no slight effect in causing the somewhat sudden conclusion of the Peace of Villafranca.

The Prussian Staff had carefully watched the progress of the campaign in Italy, and under the direction of its Chief drew up a critical military history of it, the first of the series of those valuable military works which have been issued from its office in the Königsplatz. The prospect of war with a maritime Power drove the Prussian Government to organise a system of defence of its coasts. To Moltke this task was entrusted, and he carried out its most minute details with his accustomed energy. His observations determined Prussia to create a formidable navy, and tended to urge on the unity of Germany, for he pointed out that the coasts of the independent States were entirely unprotected and offered every facility for the disembarkation of an invading force.

Almost at the same time as Moltke took up the duties of Chief of the Staff of the Army, great political changes occurred in Prussia. In 1857, in consequence of the severe illness of King Frederic William IV., the Prince of Prussia, afterwards the Emperor William I., was entrusted with the Regency of the kingdom. In 1861 the King died and William succeeded to the throne. He determined to gain for Prussia a leading position among European Powers. With wonderful acumen he

selected men to act as his instruments. Moltke was already Chief of the Staff. Von Roon was shortly made Minister of War, and Count Bismarck-Schönhausen, who had been Ambassador at Paris, was called to the Presidency of the Council and to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Such a constellation of talent, ability, and energy is rarely found in one State at the same moment, at least in its high places. These three, with the King at their head, felt that the moment was come for Prussia to stand alone and to show that she would brook no foreign interference with German home politics. The first step necessary to carry out this great project was the reorganisation of the army. The King was determined that the land forces should be put in thorough working order. Von Roon was his stanch friend and supporter. The Parliament opposed them to the utmost of its power and complained that too much money was to be spent, that the war budget would be exceeded, and that the expenditure was needless. Bismarck and Roon stood their ground firmly through all the conflict of words. During this time Moltke's work was less evident. He took no part in discussion, but at his post was daily carrying out reform in every part of the army. By 1863 the reorganisation was complete.

Events soon came to show how necessary the work was and how well it had been done. In 1863 the Prussian Staff was active, for the turmoils in Russian Poland made it doubtful whether Prussian troops might not be required to take the field. In the following year the war with Denmark on account of the Elbe Duchies broke out. In it Prussia, on account of her geographical position, took the leading part, and it fell to Moltke to draw out the plan of operations for the combined Prussian and Austrian armies. Thus his first active service was against the army in which he had borne a commission as a youth. He directed the advance of the armies which under Field-Marshal von Wrangel invaded the duchies, and, after the storming of Düppel in 1864, accompanied the King to the theatre of war, and as Chief of the Staff directed the further operations. For a moment England thought of saving Denmark single-handed from Prussia, but most fortunately wiser counsels prevailed, and British troops were not sent to prove the terrible efficacy of the Prussian needle-gun. A conference was indeed held to consider the matter at London ; but it

separated without result. England folded her hands and allowed the war to proceed.

Prince Frederick Charles, with Moltke as his Chief of the Staff, took the command of the allied forces. These two great soldiers saw that it was needful in order to convince the Danes that their enemies were powerful on all sides to occupy the islands. The Prussian flag was a few days afterwards planted on the northern point of Jutland. The islands of Sylt, Föhr, and Fehmern were occupied. The Danish army still held the important strategical island of Alsen and threatened the communications of the allies. Under Moltke's advice the allies crossed the Straits and forced the Danish division left in Alsen to capitulate. The main army retired to Funen, and already preparations for the attack on that island were in progress, when the Government of Copenhagen recognised the uselessness of further resistance, and begged for an armistice. On the 30th of October peace was signed, and Holstein, Lauenburg, and Schleswig were annexed to Germany. To these results the talents of Moltke largely contributed. They were much aided by the breech-loading rifle of the Prussian infantry and by a portion of the artillery also consisting of breech-loading guns. But in Europe at large little attention was paid to these mechanical improvements, and even in Germany they were not thoroughly appreciated. Moltke judged them at their true worth, and himself translated various books written by Danish officers which told of the terrible effect of the breech-loading armament. These he had distributed among the officers of the Prussian Army.

A larger field in which to prove his strategical genius was opened to Moltke in the war of 1866. By this time he had gained the esteem and admiration of the service. He was acknowledged to be a bold and perceptive strategist, an excellent military administrator, and a most accomplished linguist. His proficiency in languages was so extraordinary, and his reserve and modesty so marked, that he was proverbially known throughout the Prussian Army as "the man who is silent in seven languages." Austria and Prussia found cause of quarrel in the newly acquired Elbe Duchies. By the middle of June 1866 the armies on both sides were concentrating on the common frontier. The Prussian forces consisted of three armies, which by Moltke's combination advanced concentrically into Bohemia, and by carefully calculated marches and skilful

manœuvres exposed the Austrian forces to a simultaneous attack in front and rear. It had hitherto been considered exceedingly hazardous to advance into an enemy's country in different independent columns, especially through mountain passes, as two columns might be checked by small forces, while an overwhelming weight was thrown on the third, and then the columns might be destroyed in detail. But this danger, Moltke perceived, would be averted if each column could communicate almost instantly with the others. He called science to his aid. The military field telegraph was instituted, and each column could communicate in a few seconds with the others, though a hundred miles distant, and tell exactly the hostile forces in its front.

Aided thus, Moltke perfected plans by which the army of Prince Frederick Charles, joined with that of Herwarth, burst into Bohemia through Saxony, swept away the detachments left to bar their progress, and threatened the flank and rear of the main force with which Benedek hoped to check the Crown Prince. The latter, fighting hard, pushed his way through the Silesian hills. His breech-loaders swept away the badly armed Austrian columns opposed to him, and Benedek, thus assailed and threatened, fell back perforce to a rearward position on the Bistritz. Once through the mountains, the junction of the Crown Prince with Prince Frederick Charles was assured, and on the night of the 1st July their horsemen communicated with each other near Gitschin. The next day the King, with Moltke, arrived at Gitschin. Prince Frederick Charles felt the Austrian army on the Bistritz, and, fearing that it might retreat beyond the Elbe, determined to attack and hold it fast till the Crown Prince could come up within striking distance and smite it heavily in flank and rear. The consent of the King, by Moltke's advice, was given to this bold but wise view of Prince Frederick Charles. The battle of Königgrätz was the result, where the Austrian army was so utterly defeated that Benedek telegraphed immediately to his Sovereign, "Sire, you must make peace." The war was practically ended and the unity of North Germany secured.

After the battle the bulk of the Prussian armies marched on Vienna, where a fresh Austrian force was being organised out of the remnants of the army of Benedek which escaped from Königgrätz, and some of the troops victorious at Custozza,

which were being brought up from Italy. A stout resistance was expected by the Prussian Staff in front of Vienna. Reserve divisions were quickly brought up, and by the 21st of July a Prussian army of 196,000 men stood massed on the left bank of the Danube. The points of passage were already chosen. An armistice was then agreed upon, and the Peace of Prague definitely concluded on the 23rd of August.

At the close of the war Moltke wrote :—

"It is beautiful when God gives to man such an evening to his life as He has vouchsafed to the King and many of his Generals. I am now 66 years old, and for my work I have received much reward. We have made a campaign which for Prussia, for Germany, and the world is of inestimable importance."

But there was a great sorrow in store for the General. On 4th August 1866, when the victors of Königgrätz returned to Berlin, their wives and all the great ladies went to the station to greet them. Happy among the happy, Madame von Moltke was there. Her life had been singularly happy. In December 1868 she fell ill, and Christmas eve, which brings gladness to many hearts, was sad to Moltke. Before the dawn of Christmas Day his wife lay dead. They had had no children, and his life would have been very lonely had not the kindly King appointed his nephew, Lieutenant von Burt, to be his permanent aide-de-camp ; his only surviving sister, Madame von Burt, took charge of his house, and thus he was not left quite alone. But he ever cherished a most lasting and tender affection for his wife. She was buried on his property in Silesia, and whenever the General went home from Berlin his first action was to visit her grave and spend a long time there gazing on the simple monument which marked where she rested, and on which is inscribed—

"Love is the fulfilment of the law."

But there was hard work to distract his mind from private sorrow. The main results of the war of 1866 were the formation of the new North German Confederation, under the Sovereign of Prussia, and the disappearance of Austria as a Germanic Power. The Treaty of Prague was, however, but the stepping-stone, not the keystone of German unity. North Germany was indeed linked with Prussia, which now held the command of

the German forces and the power of peace and war north of the Maine. Austria stood aloof, and seemed resolved henceforth to meddle no more in German affairs. Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden remained independent of each other, but each concluded important treaties with Prussia. By that between Prussia and Bavaria these two powers mutually guaranteed the integrity of their respective territories with all the military forces at their disposal, and in case of war the King of Prussia was to have the command in chief of the Bavarian army. The treaties with Baden and Wurtemberg were of the same tenor. On account of the representations of the Emperor of the French, Saxony was not so completely absorbed into the union. The Saxon King retained the power of nominating his civil and military officers, and the Saxon army was not merged in that of the Confederation.

France, by an attitude of desire to interfere in the internal arrangements of Germany, facilitated the conclusion of those treaties; and the fact that on the 6th of August 1866 she demanded the fortress of Mainz from Prussia under threat of war, though known to but few, had doubtless an important effect. Moltke's answer to the demand was the rapid march of 60, 000 men to the Rhine; and when it was seen that Prussia was resolute, the threat was not carried out, but an excuse made that the demand was wrung from the Emperor while suffering from severe illness. The French army was then far from prepared for war. It was not thoroughly complete with men nor armed with a breech-loading weapon; and France failed to obtain after the war of 1866 territorial concessions from Germany as signally as when before that war she proffered to declare against Austria, and attack with 300,000 men, provided Prussia would cede territory on the left of the Rhine. Austria, after the war, at first seemed disposed to look to France as a future ally; but the publication of this French proposition did much to modify that feeling, and to turn her population as well as her Government to the necessary task of internal, financial, and military reorganisation.

Though the claims of France to German territory made in 1866 were withdrawn, they were renewed in 1867 in a form which, though less summary, equally threatened to disturb the peace of Europe. A proposition was made by the King of Holland to sell the fortress of Luxemburg to France. Germany

quickly was excited. A Prussian garrison held Luxemburg on behalf of Germany, and the King of Prussia, not anxious for a French war, but feeling that it would be the readiest mode of completing German unity, refused to abandon his charge. A conference, proposed by the neutral Powers, met in London; the Duchy was declared neutral and its neutrality guaranteed. Prussia withdrew her garrison, and the fortifications were to be razed. This concession was not very material, as the fortifications had been erected before the invention of rifled ordnance, and the strength of the fortress lay in its natural position. War was for the time averted, and many men believed that all difficulties were arranged between France and Prussia, that Austria was crippled, Russia unprepared, and that a lasting peace was really about to dawn upon Europe.

But those who looked below the surface saw that France was brooding, and pushing forward armaments and military organisation. Moltke well knew this. His system of intelligence from France was excellent; every change in armament and every movement of battalions was known to him. The war which he had long foreseen broke out, indeed, suddenly, but found him prepared. In England it caused great surprise, although in the spring of 1870 French agents were abroad in all our southern counties buying corn and forage. The excuses for enormous purchases of this description were that the season had been so dry that no harvest was expected in France. But these excuses were transparent, for had forage been so very scarce in France, French dealers would not have cared, simultaneously with an enormous rise in the price of forage, to largely export horses to France. At the same time, a flotilla was secretly collected in the northern French ports, capable of transporting 40,000 men and 12,000 horses. These things were carefully noted by Moltke's agents, but the British Government, against which the arrangements might have been equally directed, remained in happy ignorance of any danger of war, and within a few hours of the outbreak of hostilities our Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, as he himself stated in Parliament, "believed that there was not a cloud on the political horizon of Europe."

Immediately after the war of 1866 Moltke resumed his labours at Berlin. Under his advice the Prussian military organisation was extended to the troops of all the Northern States. The army which had fought in 1866 was augmented

by three corps. The broad principles of its organisation, as far as regarded infantry, had proved so satisfactory in the field that they were not altered. In the organisation of the cavalry, however, which was largely increased, the experience of the war dictated the necessity of a vital change. Hitherto the Prussian regiments had consisted of four squadrons in time of peace; on the outbreak of war the four squadrons took the field and a depôt was formed to supply the necessary reinforcements of men and horses. This system was found decidedly faulty during the Austrian war, and after the Treaty of Prague the Prussian regiments were increased to five squadrons, of which four take the field and one remains as a depôt to supply immediately the quick necessities of horses and men.

To this change, and to the large increase of cavalry, were due in no slight degree the wonderful successes of the German armies in the French war; for, as the Emperor of the French himself stated, the Prussian cavalry formed an impenetrable screen through which it was impossible for the enemy to discover the movements of the main armies, while every movement of French troops was faithfully and accurately reported to the German headquarters. Directly after the war of 1866 all muzzle-loading guns were laid aside and the entire artillery were armed with breech-loaders.

When the French Empire was threatened with war on account of the Luxemburg question in 1867 the nominal strength of the army was 600,000 men: but it was practically found that it would have been impossible to place in line of battle, after providing for depôts and necessary detachments, much more than 150,000 men. It was evident that the military system required reorganisation, and in 1868 the reorganisation elaborated by Marshal Niel became law. By this new system, which was, as its predecessor, based on conscription, the forces of the Empire were divided into three classes—the Active Army, the Reserve, and the National Guard. The service under the colours was fixed at five years, after which the soldier was to be placed in the Reserve for four years more. Young men who were not drawn for the Active Army were to serve four years in the Reserve and five in the National Guard. This system was inferior to the German, because part of the reserve were not trained at all in the regular army, and the service in the ranks being five years instead of three a smaller

force of trained men could be annually passed into the Reserve. Another distinction of great importance existed between the two military systems. In Prussia no man required for military service could purchase a substitute; in France any one liable to military duty was exempted, by payment to the State of a sum of 2500f., and the State undertook with the money so paid to replace him by another soldier. It is doubtful whether the fund thus obtained was judiciously administered, for it was found that on the outbreak of war the real strength of the French battalions was considerably inferior to the paper strength.

Nor was the system as laid down literally carried out, for it was objectionable to the people, and in such an excitable and feverish population it was not advisable to train the National Guard to a perfect knowledge of weapons and drill. The result was that, although the reorganisation of 1868 theoretically placed more than 800,000 combatants at the disposal of the Emperor, and raised the military forces of France to more than 1,200,000 men, the army fit to take the field at the commencement of the war mustered barely 400,000 soldiers. Of these 40,000 were at Cherbourg, preparing to embark in the flotilla which had been collected in the northern ports; 5000 were at Rome, 10,000 in Algeria, 35,000 in Paris and at Châlons, 10,000 at Lyons, and about 30,000 at Marseilles, Toulouse, Rochefort, Bordeaux, Toulon, and in hospital. The force which could be sent towards the Rhine mustered barely 270,000 men. It was divided into eight corps and the Guards.

The Luxemburg question drew the immediate attention of the King of Prussia to the probability of a war with his western neighbour. News also came from France of a general strengthening of the eastern fortresses. The reorganisation of the army by Marshal Niel and the rapid armament of the French infantry with the breech-loading Chassepôt rifle showed that a conflict might be expected within a short time. Careful precautions were taken on the Prussian side, and already in December 1867, Moltke worked out and laid before the King a plan for the railway transport of the armies of Germany to the Rhine and a plan of campaign against France. So carefully were the details of the transport arranged that when war broke out more than two years afterwards they had hardly to be altered. The

key of Moltke's plan of campaign, as exposed in his history of this war, which was published from the office of the German staff in 1874, was "to find the main body of the enemy and to attack it wherever found." The mobilisation of the army was prepared in every detail, and Moltke, with a keen but bold strategy, fixed the point of concentration in the Bavarian palatinate, between the Rhine and the Moselle. The assembly of the whole German force here protected the upper as well as the lower Rhine, and allowed for an offensive movement into France, which would probably prevent any invasion of German territory. It might appear hazardous to concentrate the armies on the French side of the Rhine, where they might be attacked before they were united, but his calculations were so perfect and his arrangements so complete, that under his magician's hand this danger disappeared. For every detachment the day and hour of its departure from its garrison and arrival near the frontier was laid down.

On the 10th day after mobilisation was ordered, the first troops would descend from their railway carriages close by the French frontier, and on the thirteenth day 60,000 combatants would be there in position; and on the eighteenth day this force would be swelled to 300,000 men. He calculated that only on the eighth day, in most favourable circumstances, could the French cross the frontier with 150,000 men, when there was time for the Prussian staff to stop their railway transport at the Rhine and there disembark their forces. To move from the frontier at Saarlouis to the Rhine the French would require at least six marches, and could only reach the river on the fourteenth day to find the passages occupied by overwhelming German forces. For on the German side there were ready to take the field, as soon as their rapid mobilisation was complete, the twelve corps of the North German Confederation, mustering at least 360,000 men; and the armies of Bavaria, Würtemberg, Darmstadt, Saxony, and Baden, which were under the supreme command of the King of Prussia in virtue of the treaties concluded after the campaign of 1866, raised the field forces of that Sovereign to over 500,000 combatants. These were well sustained by an effective and organised system of depôts and reserves, administered by an elastic and proved machinery and handled by abstemious and well-trained officers. An iron discipline knit the Prussian soldiery together, previous victories

gave entire confidence in their leaders, and a high sense of duty and of self-denial pervaded the ranks.

In the French army, on the other hand, there was much enthusiasm and great gallantry, but discipline had been allowed to lapse. Luxurious ideas, fostered by a rapid increase of national wealth, pervaded some portion of the officers. Many of the others raised from the ranks were wanting in the high military education which alone gives to a leader the confidence of his followers, or fits him for the rapid decision and quick judgment that are constantly necessary in war. In armament the French troops were superior, for they were provided with the Chassepôt rifle, which, with the common advantage of being a breech-loader, was superior in range and accuracy to the needle-gun. The latter had been adopted in the early days of the invention of breech-loaders by the Prussian Government, which had been averse from incurring the inconveniences of a change of arm, except for some well-defined advantage. Still, the French superiority in this respect was more than counterbalanced by the hurried and excited manner in which the French troops on more than one occasion handled their weapons.

On the other hand, the German soldier was more suitably equipped for European war than the French. Discarding the cumbrous equipage necessary for the formation of camps or the refinements of cooking, the German troops were prepared during a campaign to trust to the shelter which villages nearly always afford in Western Europe, or, in case of necessity, to bivouac in the open air, while a small mess-tin carried by each soldier sufficed for his culinary wants. The French soldier, on the contrary, was weighed down with *tentes d'abri*, heavy cooking apparatus, and an enormous kit. These were generally useless, frequently lost, always encumbrances; but an army accustomed to African or Asiatic war clings pertinaciously to the idea of canvas covering, fails to realise the different conditions under which campaigns must be conducted in Europe, and shudders at the idea of an exposure in war to which every true sportsman will willingly consent for pleasure. The French army was heavily equipped, on the experience of Africa, China, and Mexico, and suffered seriously from that cause among others.

The celebrated interview between the King of Prussia and the French Ambassador, M. Benedetti, took place at Ems on

the 13th of July 1870. On the 14th a Cabinet Council was held at St. Cloud, and it was determined to call up the French reserves. On the 15th a declaration by the French Ministry was made in the Senate and Corps Législatif simultaneously of war against Prussia, and was rapturously applauded in both Houses. The plans matured in peace by Moltke were now to be tested. They were not found wanting. Late at night, on the 15th of July, the King of Prussia ordered the mobilisation of the whole German army. The 16th was the first day of mobilisation; on the 26th the mobilisation was complete; and on the 3rd of August three army corps stood formed in order of battle south of the Moselle, between the Saar and the Rhine, and ready to advance into France. While the German army was being mobilised, the French lost all advantage which their hasty declaration of war should have given. Their army, instead of having been ready before the declaration of war, was unprepared to advance, and instead of dashing boldly into Germany lay inactive on the frontier. Thus the German army was able unhindered to assume the offensive with superior numbers.

Moltke's plan of the campaign was that the army of the Crown Prince should advance on the east of the Vosges Mountains, on the German left, that of Prince Frederick Charles in the centre, and that of Steinmetz on the right, to the west of the Vosges. Moltke expected to find the united French army on the Moselle between Nancy and Metz, but his cavalry soon informed him that they were not even concentrated, but in scattered corps. On the 4th of August the French corps which occupied St. Avold, a small town on the road from Metz to the frontier line of the Saar at Saarbruck, made a movement towards the latter place. The Emperor and Prince Imperial were present, and the French soldiery thought that the advance had at last really begun, and that they were upon the high road to Berlin. The movement was not, however, pushed; the French did not even cross the frontier in force, but occupied the strong heights of Spicheren.

Meanwhile the German troops had drawn swiftly and silently down to the frontier. In the early morning of the 6th of August, the Crown Prince had massed his forces behind the dark woods which lie north of Weissemburg. Thence, soon after daybreak, he sprang upon the unsuspecting advanced

guard of the corps of Marshal MacMahon, and drove them back with great loss on Wörth. The same day Prince Frederick Charles and Steinmetz stormed the heights of Spicheren, and drove the French occupants of that position in full retreat towards Metz. On the 8th the Crown Prince came upon Marshal MacMahon at Wörth, and after a severe battle, in which the French leader showed much tactical resource, overthrew him completely, and the Marshal retreated in great confusion on Nancy. The future Emperor Frederick, at Wörth, tore from the brows of the French army the laurels which a too credulous world had uncritically accorded to it, and proved that the army of France, however much animated by enthusiasm and gallantry, was unable to withstand the stern onset of the German soldiery directed with judgment and conducted with skill.

Reports soon came in which showed that the whole French army contemplated a retreat from the line of the Moselle towards Châlons. Then Moltke conceived the daring plan of throwing the German force between Bazaine and Châlons and cutting off the French retreat. Prince Frederick Charles crossed the Moselle and engaged Bazaine's retreating columns in the bloody battle of Mars-la-Tour. Here he held the French General, who had 180,000 men, with his 90,000, and although he lost heavily, he gripped him tight and prevented his further retreat. Other German corps hurried up in support; and on the 18th the main German army, with its rear to Paris, engaged Bazaine at Gravelotte, and, after a severe fight, drove him back into Metz, where his force was quickly surrounded by Prince Frederick Charles, was shut up from all further participation in the war, and was finally compelled to capitulate in the latter part of October.

After the battle of Wörth the remains of the corps of Marshal MacMahon made good their retreat to Châlons. Here they were reorganised as rapidly as possible, and reinforced by all the levies which could be hurried up to their aid. The Emperor in person had left Metz before the battle of Mars-la-Tour, and was also at Châlons. For military reasons the army should have retreated on Paris, but political circumstances would not allow the adoption of this course. The Crown Prince, so soon as Bazaine was invested, advanced in pursuit of MacMahon towards Châlons. To support him a fourth army was

formed, of four corps, and placed under the Crown Prince (the present king) of Saxony, and called the Army of the Meuse. By Moltke's advice the march of these two armies was so arranged that the third army, forming the left wing, was one day in advance of the fourth army which formed the right wing. In case of collision with the enemy, the Meuse army was to attack him in front, and the third army on his right flank, so as to force him in the direction of the Belgian frontier and off the road to Paris. Meanwhile it had been decided at Châlons, under pressure of political circumstances, that MacMahon should make a circuitous movement to the north, and endeavour to reach Metz by way of Rheims, Mezières, and Sedan, and there aid Bazaine to escape from the toils cast around him by Prince Frederick Charles.

While the German cavalry hurried forward in front of the armies of the two Crown Princes to gather news of the French movements, the Chief of the Staff joined the headquarters of the Crown Prince of Prussia on the 24th of August at Ligny. A council of war was held. It was known that the French army was near Rheims, and rumours gathered by the cavalry from the country people told that MacMahon contemplated a march to Metz. It was then determined to continue the march towards Châlons. On his arrival at Bar-le-Duc General Moltke went to walk on the ancient walls of that once fortified town. He meditated on the state of the campaign, and then for the first time the thought struck him of what MacMahon really was doing, and he saw that it was possible that the French leader might endeavour to throw himself into Metz behind the advancing German armies, and at the same time threaten their lines of communication. He went to his quarters and there studied the possibility of such a movement and the measures to be taken to counteract it. He found that the proposed French march could be carried out, and that to defeat it the enemy's columns must at the latest be stopped on the right bank of the Meuse and attacked, and that the position of the German armies allowed them to be attacked there by the fourth army in front, and the third army on their right flank with overwhelming force. In the course of the evening, reports from the advanced cavalry showed that the enemy was moving from Rheims in an easterly direction towards Metz. Moltke studied the reports by aid of his maps, in which each detachment of troops was marked

with a pin, and soon concluded that there could be no doubt that the French General was marching on Metz. He at once laid his views before the King, and obtained his permission that the march on Paris should be given up, and that the third and fourth armies, wheeled to the right, should march towards the north.

These movements brought on the battle of Sedan. On the 30th of August, the Crown Prince of Saxony, moving down the right bank of the Meuse, surprised the French advance at Mouzon; for the French army, instead of making forced marches of about twenty miles a day, on account of want of discipline among the new levies and the failure of transport arrangements, was only able to make about six. On the same day the Crown Prince of Prussia also engaged the heads of Marshal MacMahon's columns at Beaumont and Donchery and drove them in. On the 1st of September the two armies, under the eyes of the King of Prussia, attacked the position which the French had taken up at Sedan. The Crown Prince threw his left completely round the French army. All day the battle raged. The French fought gallantly, even desperately, but, pressed upon by the better disciplined legions of Germany, they were pushed closer and closer to the ramparts of the fortress, while their adversaries gained a firm footing on all the heights which command and overlook the basin in which Sedan is situate. At last, hemmed in, surrounded, and exposed to the commanding fire of a numerous and superior artillery, no resource was left to the French army but capitulation. A general of the Emperor's staff was sent to the King of Prussia to propose terms for the army, and at the same time the Emperor wrote a letter to the King, and proposed to surrender his sword. The terms were the unconditional surrender of the army and the fortress. These were agreed to, and the whole French army was marched prisoner into Germany.

After the halt of a few days, necessary for the completion of arrangements at Sedan, the armies of the Crown Princes marched direct for Paris, where alone the war could be ended. There was no French army worthy of mention now in the field. Bazaine, with the Army of the Rhine, was invested in Metz, the Emperor and MacMahon were prisoners on the road to Germany. The few troops that escaped from the general catastrophe at Sedan, or had been on the way to reinforce

Marshal MacMahon, were hurried back to Paris to man the defences of the capital. The German movements were, in Moltke's fashion, at once rapid and deliberate.

On the 19th of September the investment of Paris was, in a sense, completed, though much had to be done to fix the grasp securely on the doomed victim. Here opened a second stage of the war, which for several months was directed from Moltke's quarters at Versailles. There can be little question that, in the first instance, the Germans were led away by a miscalculation, and for a time, undoubtedly, Moltke's schemes had to embrace not only offensive operations against the enemy, but a safe retreat in case of disaster. The resources of Paris, the strength of the fortifications, and the spirit of the people, had been underrated. If the Germans had not reckoned on the immediate surrender of the city, as in 1814 and 1815, they would hardly have risked an advance while Bazaine's army was still safe in Metz and while the fortresses of Alsace and Lorraine threatened their main lines of communication. When Moltke saw that Paris was not to be captured by a *coup de main*, but that it must be regularly invested, he must have passed some uneasy days and nights until Toul and Strasburg fell ; nor could his anxieties have been greatly relieved before Metz capitulated on the 28th of October. Then the problem became a comparatively simple one, for even if the German armies had been compelled to raise the siege they could have retired in perfect order and kept their hold upon the occupied departments. But, at the very outset, Moltke stood firm, and, even while the security of his communications was doubtful, a vast double line of intrenchments, thrown up by the spade, hemmed in the Parisians.

After the fall of Metz, Moltke had to deal, on the one side, with the efforts of the besieged to break through his lines, and, on the other hand, with the levying of the new French armies in the south, the north-west, and the east. General d'Aurelles proved himself on the Loire a good disciplinarian and a capable tactician ; but he had not the rapidity or the initiative which would have enabled him to use his advantages in time. General Chanzy was an abler soldier, but before his opportunity came the Germans had been strengthened by Bazaine's surrender and by reinforcements from home. General Faidherbe fought well in the north, but could not follow up his successes. General

Bourbaki was as incompetent as his army was disorganised and demoralised.

Against all these French commanders and their troops, amounting at one time, in the aggregate, to from 400,000 to 500,000 men, Moltke played his game skilfully and coolly, launching against them his subordinate armies, which either checked or crumpled up the enemy, but never relaxing the rigour of the investment, and meeting the desperate sorties of the besieged with the stern resistance of a rock. Yet almost to the end there was danger of a junction, by some combination of events, between the Army of the Loire and Trochu's garrison, which, for the time, might have turned the tide of fortune. The Germans, however, guided by Moltke's genius, did not miss a point in the game, until at length Bourbaki's reckless strategy afforded an opening for what a military critic, writing in these columns, described as "an overwhelming blow, directed with consummate ability." The operations of Werder and Manteuffel attained their object perfectly. Bourbaki's army went to pieces and was driven into Switzerland, and from that time forward there was no serious prospect of raising the siege of Paris. "If Von Moltke," the critic we have quoted wrote, "had never done anything else, this single operation would mark him out as one of the master spirits of war, nor less admirable were the precision, the intelligence, and the decisive speed with which the Germans went down on their foe."

Thenceforward the issue of the siege was only a matter of time. Paris fell by the pressure of hunger. Even Moltke had not truly estimated the strength of the fortifications, which remained unbroken when the gates were opened to the investing armies; and the struggle might have been prolonged for months if there had been any means of getting supplies of food. Perhaps no part of Moltke's work was more remarkable than the complete success with which he solved a problem only one degree less difficult than that of victualling Paris—the provision of supplies during the winter for the investing armies, in a country to a great extent stripped of its resources, and where a prolonged siege had not been contemplated. It is curious that those who planned the fortifications had calculated that no investing army could subsist outside the walls for more than two months, whereas the German investment lasted for five months.

Versailles became thus the scene of the most important part of Moltke's life-work. At Versailles, on the 26th of October, he passed his 70th birthday, and on that day he was raised by the King of Prussia, upon the reception of the news of the capitulation of Metz, to the rank of Count. From Versailles he had directed for nearly six months the movements which the German armies undertook from the Channel to the Loire to prevent the interruption of the blockade, and guided the complicated operations over this wide theatre of war. The French armies which attempted to raise the blockade of the capital had been, through his dispositions, successively defeated at Orleans, St. Quentin, Amiens, in the valley of the Doubs, and at Le Mans. His task was completed. The battle of Le Mans decided the fate of Paris. Provisions had already been getting short. One more sortie was, indeed, made by the garrison, but it was seen that assistance from without could no longer be hoped for. On the 27th of January an armistice was agreed to, and peace was signed at Frankfort in May 1871.

A short time before the conclusion of hostilities the King of Prussia, in the palace of Versailles, was proclaimed Emperor of Germany amid the cheers of the assembled German chieftains and within the sound of the guns engaged in the bombardment of Paris. On his return to Berlin, Moltke was raised by his grateful Sovereign to the rank of field-marshal, and the Parliament voted him a grant of £45,000. Berlin, Leipsic, Hamburg, Madgeburg, made him a freeman, and on the anniversary of the capitulation of Paris he was called for life to the Prussian Upper House ; one of the new forts at Strasburg and a corvette built at Dantsic received his name. In 1874 he was elected by the Berlin Academy of Science to fill the knighthood vacant through the death of King John of Hanover. Parchim, his birthplace, erected in his honour a colossal statue, which was unveiled in October 1876, in the presence of the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg and various military deputations.

In 1879 Moltke completed sixty years' service. The Emperor William I. on this occasion sent him a letter of congratulation, signed "Your thankful King," with the Star of the Order of Merit, and the whole of the officers of the German Staff united to raise a monument in his honour in front of his house at Kreisau. Count Moltke represented in the Reichstag,

from the time of its formation in 1867, the West Prussian county of Memel-Heydekrug; but still conducted his military duties as Chief of the Staff of the army. Till quite a late date he in person conducted the annual travels of the General Staff, and again reconnoitred the German coast as well as the newly-acquired territories of Alsace and Lorraine, and presided over a commission appointed to investigate improvements in the coast defences. The experiences of the French war with regard to mobilisation were carefully collated under his supervision; the readiness of the army for the field improved, and its strength increased by augmentation of the peace establishments; a better organisation of the reserves and Landwehr in case of war was also adopted on his suggestion. Every year Moltke, as Chief of the Staff, accompanied the Emperor to the autumn manœuvres, and acted as chief military adviser, and personally looked through the tactical exercises of officers intended for the Staff.

Moltke lived to see his aged master, the Emperor William I., pass away in the fulness of years and honours, and a few months later, in June 1888, after the short reign of the Emperor Frederick, he paid his homage, among the other founders of the new German Empire, at the accession of William II. On 29th August in the same year the great "organiser of victory" resigned his office as Chief of the Staff of the German Armies, which he had held during the most eventful and the most splendid period in the history of his country. It was officially announced that he retired because of his advanced age, which no longer allowed him to mount his horse. The Emperor accepted Count Moltke's resignation, with eloquent expressions of gratitude and regret, and appointed as his successor Count Waldersee, who had for some time been his assistant. Moltke was then nominated President of the National Defence Commission, a dignified and not wholly honorary office, which had been filled in succession by the Emperor William I., when Prince of Prussia, and by the Emperor Frederick, when Crown Prince of Germany. Down to the day of his death he continued to act as military adviser of the General Staff, and it is understood that he has lately been working actively upon the plans for the fortification of Heligoland.

In March 1889 the seventieth anniversary of his entrance

upon the military career was celebrated, and in the succeeding November he received a special badge of honour as having been for half a century a member of the order "Pour le Mérite." Still more striking were the honours paid to the veteran Field-Marshal in October of last year, when he attained his 90th birthday. The Emperor and the Court, the army and the people, joined in showing their affectionate reverence for one of the makers of Germany, whose brilliant achievements had never marred the simplicity of his character or developed a restless ambition. There was an imposing demonstration of the unequalled military machinery his patient toil had perfected; there was a vast procession in the streets of Berlin to honour the patriarch of German war; there was a public holiday in all the schools of Germany. This was the crowning point in a wonderful career, and Moltke had nothing more to expect from a life of singular fruitfulness and well-balanced strength.

Moltke's iron constitution, unhurt by unbroken work, long withstood the impress of time. Tall of stature and somewhat lean, he rode well, and was always well mounted. Cool in battle, whenever requisite he freely exposed himself to danger, but with a modest calm devoid of all desire of effect. To observe the disposition of the enemy at Königgrätz, he rode among the advanced line of skirmishers in the wood of Sadowa. The motto that he took for his coat of arms when he was made a Count—instead of his old family device of "Candide et caute"—"Erst wägen, dann wagen," "First weigh, then wage," well points his military policy. His plans were well weighed, his warfare was waged boldly, sternly, and decisively. Long and carefully he calculated, but when his decision was once made he rushed straight on his objective point. He was kind and considerate to subordinates, allowed them much freedom of action, and never feared to accept responsibility; thus he was well served. Loyal to his superiors throughout his life, he regarded duty fulfilled, not fame acquired, as the object of his career. As a politician he belonged to the Conservative party, but was animated by a deep love of his fatherland, of which his Sovereign had described him as the sword.

The Emperor William I., in the first flush of the exultation inspired by the surrender of Paris, had publicly hailed Moltke as the true author of the German triumph. Without doing

injustice to other and equally important elements—the statesmanship of Bismarck, the organising power of Roon, the soldierly qualities of the German army, the endurance and self-sacrifice of the German people—the Emperor's judgment was felt to be substantially just. Moltke acquired an authority among his countrymen which he enjoyed to the end, and which, with his manly preference for silence over speech, he never abused. Deeply attached to the cause of that national unity which he had so largely shared in making possible, and bound to his master and coeval, the Emperor William I., by personal ties of duty and affection, entirely unwarped by ambition or selfwill, Moltke rarely took part in politics except to give the weight of his counsel to the settled policy of the Imperial Government in keeping abreast with the armaments of France and Russia.

As often as the Emperor and Prince Bismarck made new appeals to the nation for an addition to the strength of the army, Count Moltke was ready to produce an array of reasons in favour of the measure. His view of the state of Europe was that it was in unstable equilibrium, that to be left behind in military preparations would be as unwise as to disarm, and that France was bent on the *revanche*. These arguments Moltke put with great force in a speech delivered in the Reichstag in 1877 on the question of increasing the number of officers, and he repeated them with still greater energy, and with the support of elaborate statistics, in a speech on the Military Bill in 1880, declaring, in language which produced considerable sensation, that "an iron necessity imposed upon Germany the duty of making new sacrifices." He was less successful in his support of the first Socialist Bill, which was rejected by the National Liberals, and was only carried in the revulsion of popular feeling after Nobiling's crime. Again, in 1886, when a new proposal for increasing the army was brought forward, Count Moltke took a prominent part in favour of the policy of the Government. He urged that France was eager to win back Alsace and Lorraine, and that the failure to pass the Bill "would involve a very serious responsibility, perhaps the misery of a hostile invasion." In the following year he again pleaded the same cause, urging that if the plans of the Government were rejected there "would certainly be war," and taking his stand on the proposition that "the army is the first insti-

tution of all in the country, for it alone renders the existence of all other institutions possible; all political and civil liberty, all the results of culture, the finances, the State—all stand or fall with the army." Though Count Moltke was not more successful than Prince Bismarck in converting the majority of the Reichstag in 1887 to the policy of additional troops and a renewal of the "military Septennate," his authority had a great effect in the subsequent elections which shattered the Opposition and carried the Army Bill with a rush.

Moltke's private life was simple and calm; he was a kind friend and a good landlord. In latter years he spent any time of repose from his work on his country place at Kreisau, where his wife lies buried.

ARCHBISHOP MAGEE

1821–1891

OBITUARY NOTICE, SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1891

LESS than five months ago we recorded the death of Archbishop Thomson. To-day, it is our painful duty to announce that of his successor. Dr. Magee, Archbishop of York, died at half-past three o'clock yesterday morning, quite painlessly and peacefully, at a hotel in Suffolk Street, Pall Mall. He had been ill for about a fortnight of influenza, which a day or two ago gave way to bronchitis and inflammation of the lungs; and to this complication of diseases the Archbishop quickly succumbed, enfeebled as he had been by more than one serious illness during recent years.

Of the Archbishop it may well be said that his mourners will be two hosts—his friends and foes. That stern joy "which warriors feel in foemen worthy of their steel," was given to all who encountered Dr. Magee in any field for a fair fight; and those who were most often in conflict with him will miss him most, for a true opponent is even rarer than a true friend, and the respect we feel for the one borders close upon the love which we cherish for the other. Dr. Magee was a shrewd, learned, and just man. The words conjure up at once a picture of tribulations, for the faculty of justice is most exercised by correcting the unjust weights and measures of our own associates; but Dr. Magee was good-humoured, and could happily make disciples whom he had rebuked for wrong-headedness laugh with him against themselves. His eloquence, both as preacher and debater, was great, and he knew the difference between preaching and debating. Clergymen and barristers, who usually address silent

audiences, often lose presence of mind when they have to speak in places where they are liable to interruptions; and, conversely, ready debaters will sometimes be quite unable to express their thoughts if not stimulated by cheers and signs of disapproval.

The Archbishop's versatility was the product of a lively Irish character and of a highly-trained intellect. He was heard at his best in the Session of 1883 in the House of Lords, when, speaking on the Cathedral Bill, he described with exuberant sarcasm the position of Churchmen unable to remove the abuses of their Church because of Nonconformist or Agnostic enemies, who were interested in letting these excrescences grow as germs of a mortal disease. He said that the Ministry would not dare to introduce any measure of Church Reform for fear of "irritating their great backbone," and he caused general amusement by sketching the probable fate of a Church Bill struggling through the House of Commons amid amendments moved by certain Irish members. Bishops are not accustomed to speak with such elaborate playfulness as Dr. Magee used on this occasion, nor would many of their right reverend lordships be able to match their late colleague's irresistible manner if they tried to do so. With his large mouth, shaggy eyebrows, and twinkling eyes; with his expressive wags of the head, and quick, forcible gestures; with his droll sallies and occasional outbursts of strong emotion, the Bishop of Peterborough compelled attention.

When he was promoted from the Deanery of Cork to an English see—a piece of preferment for which there was no precedent—Mr. Disraeli, who had advised his appointment, was asked what he most admired in the man. The Premier, who had possibly not often heard Dr. Magee preach, answered—"He is persuasive." That was true, but it might perhaps have been truer to say that the Bishop was "disconcerting." He shed new lights so suddenly and vividly on a question that his hearers were frequently taken aback, and confessed to themselves that if they had seen the matter in this way before they would have acted differently. But the man who shed tears in a law court from hearing his woes described by an imaginative counsel, doubtless consoled himself when he got home; and so politicians who were put out of conceit with their measures by Dr. Magee's exposure of what was bad in them, were not necessarily per-

suaded that the measures ought to be abandoned. The Bishop himself never despaired because his warnings were unheeded. Neither as a theologian nor as a statesman did he belong to the alarmist school of those who prophesy irremediable disasters.

The son of the Rev. John Magee, vicar of Drogheda, and the grandson of Dr. William Magee, sometime Bishop of Raphoe, and afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, author of a once well-known book on the Atonement, William Connor Magee was born at Cork in 1821. He was sent to Trinity College, Dublin, in his fourteenth year, and made his mark there both as a scholar and as a debater in the Historical Society. Even at this time he showed a gay disposition to ridicule extreme opinions, so that he was once asked whether he might not have something to say for Philip and Mary—a challenge to which he responded by a racy disquisition on the quality of Protestantism as professed by Henry VIII. and Elizabeth.

After his ordination, Magee officiated for a time in a Dublin parish, but, being obliged to travel for his health, he went to Malaga for two years, and on his return accepted the curacy of St. Saviour's, Bath. He had studied a good deal while abroad, and had become much impressed by the religious indifferentism that was gaining ground on the Continent, owing to the corruption of the simple Christian doctrine by means of Mariolatry. He became at once noted as a sound Evangelical preacher, but his early sermons were chiefly relished from being interspersed with anecdotes, jests, and ingenious parables, and from being delivered in animated conversational style, showing that his heart and mind were both full when he spoke. He had observed foreign habits of gesticulating to some purpose, and was not afraid of thumping his pulpit cushion repeatedly, to "ram a truth down," as Mr. Spurgeon puts it. In 1850, he obtained the incumbency of the Octagon Chapel at Bath, and held this benefice for nine years, during which time his reputation spread far beyond Somersetshire.

The Liberation Society having started into life, the Bath Church Defence Association was formed as a local counter-agent, and, in connection with it, Mr. Magee delivered his memorable lecture on the voluntary system and the Established Church. The effect of this able advocacy of the Establishment was very great, and it led to the creation of a number of other defence

associations; but, as priest and as bishop, Magee always fought against the idea that the vitality of the Church of England would be impaired by a severance of the connection with the State. He thought the connection good for the State, but he was earnest in advising that Churchmen should face the possibility of disestablishment, and be prepared to make such a measure, if it came, turn to the benefit of the Church. He never quite forgave Mr. Disraeli for having made his Cardinal Grandison, in "Lothair," sneer at the Establishment as a "Parliamentary Church," for the words seemed somehow to reflect the writer's own private opinions—those of a Gallio who cared not much for Churches save in their political uses.

After he had been raised to a bishopric, two years before "Lothair" appeared, and at the height of the agitation on the Irish Church question, Dr. Magee gave some disappointment to the Conservative leader by not espousing the cause of the Church of Ireland as one of life and death for that Church, and for the English Establishment as well. In the fine and famous speech which he delivered in the House of Lords in 1869, against Mr. Gladstone's Bill, the Bishop of Peterborough used every argument in support of the Church, except that one which was most often heard from Tory speakers, and which implied that Ireland was about to be given over to Roman Catholic domination. A Liberal statesman took note of this, and remarked to Magee that by his own showing the Irish Church would become stronger after disestablishment than it was before. "Well," answered the Bishop, "you may break my leg, and when it has been set I may walk better on it than I did previously; but it does not follow that I should thank you for what you did, and"—folding his arms and looking combative—"I doubt whether you would be pleased with yourself afterwards for having broken my leg."

In 1860 Dr. Magee left Bath, and succeeded Dr. Goulburn as minister of Quebec Chapel, London, having meanwhile been appointed to an honorary canonry of Wells. In 1864 he was promoted to the deanery of Cork, and in 1868 he was raised to the English Episcopal bench, as successor to Dr. Jeune, at Peterborough. Before this time he had taken rank among those popular preachers who go starring—nothing invidious is meant by the comparison—much like favourite actors. Pulpit eloquence is not so common as might be expected from the

number of ministers who practise to attain it ; and the parishioners of a renowned church orator have often reason to complain that he does not give them the best of what he has to say. Against Dr. Magee no such charge could lie, for he had too much native wit ever to deliver a dull sermon. He liked to preach before select congregations at Oxford, Cambridge, and in the Chapels Royal ; and to masses in the special services at St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey ; but wherever he was going to preach he pondered over what he meant to say and drew up full notes, never trusting wholly to inspiration. On important occasions, as in his sermons as Select Preacher at Oxford, he literally learnt his sermons by heart, and delivered them as though extempore.

His doctrine was of the sort which pleases most Englishmen, going on broad lines, though it is not to be denied that it changed somewhat with the Church fashions of the age, so that it might be said of him, as of some other prelates, that rising in his profession he became "higher" in more senses than one. The Church Patronage Bill, which he introduced with a view to putting all benefices at the disposal of Bishops, was a measure which he would have attacked with warmth in his younger days, and it was one for which his episcopal brethren did not much thank him. It stirred up a Patronage Defence Association, which favoured the public with some queer revelations as to the manner in which prelates were accustomed to dispense such patronage as they possessed already. In one thing Dr. Magee never changed, for he remained courageous in advancing unconventional opinions which were intended to shock prejudices that he loathed and cant which he held in equal abhorrence. He was once asked to interest himself in a carpenter's son who was doing well at a small school, and whom it was proposed to send to a University. "Let him first graduate as a good carpenter," answered Magee. "What becomes of your boasted concern for the welfare of the working classes if you lift a man out of those classes as soon as he shows brains?"

It will not be forgotten that the late Archbishop took his stand against the excesses of the teetotal movement by saying that he "would rather see England free than sober." A curate of his diocese appeared before him wearing a blue riband in his buttonhole. "I suppose you have reflected," said Magee,

"that if you are respected in your parish you need not sport any emblem to advertise your character as a temperate man; whereas, if you are not respected this piece of blue will only remind people of the Pharisees and the phylactery." To a lady who was wearing the same symbol the Bishop said quite as pointedly, "Now, recollect that this pledges you to a great deal. Men may go wrong through love of drink, but girls come to trouble through love of finery; so if you are bent on setting an example, just put off your silks and rings and show yourself in plain black or gray without trimmings, kiltings, or bustles."

Quite recently, in a similar spirit, he showed himself tolerant, under certain circumstances, of betting. He would not have objected to the St. Leger; but he would probably have drawn the line at baccarat. Dr. Magee was no friend of auricular confession. In one of his sermons on this matter he inveighed with vigorous irony against what he termed "drawing-room divinity," "tea-table theology," and "the homœopathic doses of popery served up to young ladies and *very* young gentlemen by clergymen of a prying turn." To the Ritualists such sayings were gall; and so were the Bishop's remarks about "petticoated curates," in allusion to the young divines who trudge about country parishes in cassocks. Much more might be gleaned from the Bishop of Peterborough's homely sayings by way of showing how cool his sense was; but those who knew him hardly need such reminders, and those who did not will gather a sufficient idea of his nature from what has been already said in these lines.

In 1883 the Bishop had a long and severe illness, and more than once his life was despaired of. But he recovered; and in the next year was able to take his accustomed part both in the affairs of his diocese and in the business of the House of Lords. At Peterborough he was, of course, generally admired; and it may be added that he was liked by all except those who, from extreme practices, or self-will, or folly of any exceptional kind, had brought themselves into a position of antagonism towards him. His attitude towards the questions of Church discipline which agitated, and still agitate, the clergy is well explained in a letter which, in March of last year, he addressed to the Archdeacon of Oakham, with reference to the Archbishop of Canterbury's judgment as to his jurisdiction in the Bishop of Lincoln's case. After expressing his dissent from certain points

in the judgment, he proceeded: "Ritual prosecutions to enforce obedience to disputable rubrics by the help of courts of disputed authority, ending in an appeal to a court, the jurisdiction of which a large number, both of the clergy and the laity, will never recognise, will never bring us peace." He hated these suits, penalties, imprisonments, and he cried out for, "even at this eleventh hour, a *modus vivendi*."

This was his feeling towards the divisions within the Church; as to the attacks upon the position from outside, he said and did but little. If he had been asked why, he would probably have answered that he had no time to busy himself with going down to the roots of principles of which he personally was perfectly satisfied. He had, like every modern Bishop, more than enough to do in his diocese; and, besides, there was Convocation and there was the House of Lords. In the former he appeared frequently; in the latter, though latterly he did not often speak, he made an exception last year in the case of his Insurance of Children Bill, for putting stronger restrictions upon a practice which often leads to the most shocking and murderous abuses. The Bill was referred to a Select Committee, of which Dr. Magee until last week was chairman.

In January last died Dr. Thomson, Archbishop of York; and Lord Salisbury, amid general applause, advised the appointment as his successor of the most eloquent and one of the ablest of the Bishops. Dr. Magee was enthroned on the 17th of March, but he did not live long enough to take a very active part in the affairs of the northern See and province. He was publicly received at Hull, Beverley, and elsewhere; and he presided at one meeting of the Convocation of the northern province, when he explained and justified the Clergy Discipline Bill. He was just settling down to his work when the epidemic seized him. His death leaves a gap which it will hardly be possible to fill, and it will be long before the Church of England boasts another prelate with so rich an endowment of wisdom, eloquence, and humour as had fallen to the portion of Dr. Magee. It may be added that he was married in 1851 to Miss Ann Nisbitt, second daughter of the Rev. Charles Smith, Rector of Arklow. Mrs. Magee survives him, and he leaves a family of sons and daughters.

SIR JOHN MACDONALD

1815–1891

OBITUARY NOTICE, MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1891

THE Right Hon. Sir John Alexander Macdonald, G.C.B., LL.D., D.C.L., was the son of a Sutherlandshire yeoman, Mr. Hugh Macdonald. He was born at Glasgow, 11th January 1815. Mr. Macdonald emigrated to Canada in 1820, settling with his family at Kingston, Ontario. Young Macdonald was educated at the Royal Grammar School, Kingston, and adopted the law as his profession, being called to the Bar of Upper Canada in 1836. In this profession he rapidly attained eminence, and those who are accustomed to regard him as a politician and man of business above all things may have almost forgotten that until the year 1869 he regularly filled the post of Attorney-General in the successive Ministries of which he was a member. He became a Bencher of the Law Society of Ontario, and head of the legal firm of Macdonald and Marsh, Toronto, which had a most extensive practice. He was subsequently made a Q.C. In 1839 he achieved distinction by his memorable defence of Von Schultz, who raided Canada three years before at the head of a small band of marauders.

But it was as a politician and statesman that he was destined to win his place in Canadian history. Entering public life in 1844 as the representative of the city of Kingston in the House of Assembly, he was no more than three years before attaining to office. In December 1847 we find him Commissioner of Crown Lands. Mr. Macdonald was an advocate of progressive Conservatism as opposed to Toryism. The Cabinet of which Macdonald was a member was overthrown in

1850, and made way for the Reform Ministry of Lafontaine, Baldwin, and Hincks, which retained power until September 1854. Meanwhile Mr. Macdonald was gradually becoming remarkable for tact, assiduity, and a mastery of parliamentary procedure and usage which stood him in good stead in after life. He took a leading place at once among the debaters of the time, and his speeches on the Rebellion Losses Bill and the secularisation of the Clergy Reserves attracted marked attention for their statesmanlike breadth and ability. The latter question was the crucial topic of the day in 1854. On the defeat of the Government, Macdonald joined, as Attorney-General, the new Coalition Cabinet of MacNab-Morin, which was pledged to settle the vexed question at once and for ever. During the sway of the Coalition the Clergy Reserves were secularised on a fair and equitable basis; while seigniorial tenure in Lower Canada was also abolished. In 1856 Macdonald was chosen to succeed Sir Allan MacNab as leader of the Conservative party. This post he continued to hold until his death, and whether in office or out of it he exercised a degree of personal influence over his followers that has never been equalled in the case of any other public man in Canada.

The ministry sustained a defeat in 1858 on the question of the seat of Government, and Macdonald resigned. The Hon. George Brown was called upon to form a new Administration, and he succeeded in his task; but, being defeated on the first vote in the House of Assembly, he made way for Macdonald, who once more returned to power, taking at first the office of Postmaster-General, but resigning this the next day in order to resume his more congenial office of Attorney-General. His Ministers also changed offices, and this incident in Canadian politics gave rise to the phrase, the "double shuffle." The reorganisation of the Militia having become a "burning question" in 1862, Macdonald took the office of Minister of Militia, with the object of grappling with it. The post was a very difficult one to fill with satisfaction at this juncture, and in spite of the Minister's strenuous efforts to pass a Militia Bill, the Government were defeated, and resigned.

In March 1864, however, we find him back at his old post, with Sir Etienne P. Taché as Premier, and leader of the Lower Canadian contingent. By this time a far different and all-important question was crying for solution—the question of

proportionate representation as between Upper and Lower Canada, as Ontario and Quebec were then called. Before a year was out the difficulty was destined to be solved by an expedient that comprehended far more than the respective claims of the French and English Canadas—in a word, by Federation. In its inception, however, the problem was this. The inhabitants of Upper Canada consisted largely of United Empire loyalists, who remained loyal to British institutions, and who left the United States at the close of the War of Independence; while those of Lower Canada were almost exclusively French Canadians. The representatives from each province in the United Parliament were equal in number.

Upper Canada, however, made greater progress than Lower Canada, the population in 1851 being 952,204 and 890,261 respectively, and in 1861, 1,396,061 and 1,111,566. She consequently agitated for an additional number of members and claimed other concessions, but the demands were always opposed by Lower Canada. The result was frequent legislative deadlocks and continual difficulties. The interests of Lower Canada were ably defended by Cartier, a vivacious, astute, and determined politician. When Mr. Brown complained that the one county of Bruce with 80,000 people had not one representative, Cartier created great laughter by retorting that if heads were to be counted, then, taking in the codfish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Lower Canada had the majority. In this condition of things a stable Government by either party was impossible. Upper Canada by a double majority demanded her rights, but Lower Canada almost unanimously stood by the written Constitution.

At length a proposition was made to federalise Upper and Lower Canada and the maritime provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island. This was received with enthusiasm as a satisfactory solution of the difficulty, and a conference took place between the leaders on both sides, when the question was very fully discussed. In 1864 Macdonald attended as a delegate the conference that had been called at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, where the smaller confederation of the seaboard provinces was under consideration. Chiefly by the eloquence and tact of Macdonald, he and his associates turned the tide, and succeeded in convincing the other side that the larger union of all the British North American provinces was

much the more desirable scheme of the two. Another convention was held a few months afterwards in the city of Quebec, delegates from all the provinces being present. At this meeting the plan of union was formed.

The Canadian Parliament met at Quebec on 3rd February 1865, when the resolutions of the Quebec Conference were submitted by Sir E. P. Taché in Legislative Council, and by the Hon. John A. Macdonald in the House of Assembly. The motion of approval was carried by 91 to 33. The political deadlock, combined with severe commercial depression, made confederation absolutely imperative. Moreover, the commercial relations of Canada with the United States had been severed some years before by the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty. Confederation, therefore, now came to a head, and Macdonald took the most active and prominent part in bringing it about. He was chosen one of the delegates appointed to confer with the Imperial Government in London with reference to the terms on which union could be accomplished; and he was elected President of the meetings of the London Colonial Conference. He gave great assistance to the English law officers in drawing up the British North American Act, which was ultimately passed. The provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick were, by the Act of Union passed in 1867, combined under the title of the Dominion of Canada. Rupert's Land and the North-Western Territory were added to the Dominion in 1870; Manitoba was created a province of the Dominion in the same year; British Columbia was admitted in 1871; and Prince Edward Island was admitted in 1872.

In 1865, while the Confederation controversy was at its height, Sir E. P. Taché died, and his colleague was asked to take the Premiership; but he declined in favour of Sir Narcisse F. Belleau. Macdonald held the office of Minister of Militia jointly with that of Attorney-General from January to May 1862, and from August 1865 until the union. On the 1st of July 1867 the new Constitution came into force in Canada, and Macdonald was sworn as a Privy Councillor and appointed Minister of Justice and Attorney-General. In recognition of his services he was created a Knight Commander of the Bath (Civil Division), and some years later (1884) was advanced to the dignity of Grand Cross of the same Order. The University of Oxford and Trinity College, Toronto, conferred on him the

degree of D.C.L., and Queen's University, Kingston, and M'Gill University, Montreal, that of LL.D.

In 1869 Sir John Macdonald assumed the Premiership of Canada, and from this period may be said to date the protective policy which has formed so important a feature of his "National" programme. In 1871 Sir John Macdonald was chosen as one of the five British Commissioners appointed to settle the terms of the Washington Treaty; and here he won fresh laurels. It was generally recognised that Sir John was the ablest diplomatist engaged on the British side in that famous negotiation. Great Britain withdrew the case as to Canada's Fenian claims against the United States, but agreed to guarantee a Canadian loan of a considerable amount for public works in the Dominion. Relaxation of Customs restrictions by a "bonding" system, the free use of the fisheries, and also of certain lakes and rivers, were secured to each nation, and the compensation due to Canada for her fisheries was referred to a joint commission afterwards to sit at Halifax. This Fishery Commission, which did not report till 1877, made an award in favour of Great Britain of $5,500,000, as representing the value of the fishing privileges granted to the United States, over and above the concessions made to Canada under the Washington Treaty. For his services in connection with the Treaty of Washington in July 1872, Sir John was called to the Privy Council of Great Britain—an honour seldom conferred upon a colonial statesman.

The second general election for the Dominion of Canada took place in 1872, and the result was to sustain Sir John Macdonald's Ministry. But in the succeeding year the Government had to face a serious difficulty known as the "Pacific scandal." Before the meeting of Parliament a charter had been given to a company to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, that company being the amalgamation of two rivals, one led by Sir Hugh Allan, of Montreal, the other by Senator Macpherson, of Toronto. As soon as Parliament assembled, Mr. Huntingdon, one of the representatives for Quebec, rose in his place and charged the Government with having received large sums of money from Sir Hugh Allan to corrupt the constituencies during the late elections. The Government denied the charge, and the vote of want of confidence in them was defeated. But the attacks against the Government were renewed in Parliament and the press, and all authentic inquiry into the truth of the

allegations was rendered impossible by the disallowance by the Imperial Government of an act authorising the examination of witnesses on oath. It is not surprising that under these circumstances a good deal of the mud thrown was found to have stuck. The Opposition moved a vote of want of confidence, which was debated with great heat for a week. Meanwhile public feeling was seen to be running strongly against the Government, so Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues resigned before the vote was taken.

The Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, the Liberal leader, became Prime Minister, and Sir John Macdonald now led the Conservative Opposition for five years. But while on Imperial matters he acted as a party chief, he gave the Administration the benefit of his ability and his long experience in perfecting, among other measures of importance, the Insolvent Act and the Act which constituted the Supreme Court of the Dominion. Canada passed through a period of deep depression during the rule of the Mackenzie Ministry. Annual deficits in the revenue were recorded, and it was maintained by the Conservatives that a higher Customs tariff was needed for revenue purposes, and that by wisely adjusting the tariff an incidental protection might be given to certain struggling industries. Sir John Macdonald made this the battle-cry of his supporters, and it came to be described as the "national policy." Mackenzie, who was unwilling to increase the tariff, was called a "doctrinaire."

Accordingly, at the general election of September 1878 certain administrative blunders of the Liberal Premier, the earnest advocacy of the new protective policy, and the desire for change arising from business stagnation, resulted in the transference of a large manufacturing and industrial vote to the support of Macdonald's plans. The Conservatives carried all before them at the polls. Sir John again came into office as Premier, with a majority of 85 in a House of 206 members, and from this time he retained power continuously until his death. The new Government was pledged to the higher Customs tariff as a measure of protection against the fiscal policy of the United States and a means of fostering the native industries. The new Canadian tariff discriminated in favour of no nation, the products of all, not even excepting the mother country, Great Britain, being placed upon the same footing. The four years from 1879 to 1882 witnessed a great increase

in the home manufactures. But this prosperity must not be set down merely as the result of protection. There was a great rebound in the national confidence, following upon the severe depression which had been everywhere felt for several years immediately preceding throughout the entire Dominion. But the most momentous step of Sir John Macdonald's Administration was his signature, in 1880, of the contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Public attention has quite recently been redirected to the circumstances under which this decisive step was taken by the revelations of Sir Charles Tupper regarding the refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway to undertake the enterprise.

Public opinion ratified the Premier's spirited policy, for in 1882 Sir John's Administration was again sustained by a large majority of the Canadian electors. During his new lease of power Sir John Macdonald found himself confronted with the Red River Rebellion. In the laying out of the North-West Territories the natives who had Indian blood in their veins were not sufficiently considered in the matter of the transfer. The French Métis especially were in a disturbed state, and were led by a rash and vainglorious youth named Louis Riel. He was a French half-breed, who had been partially educated for a priest in Montreal. Riel arrested a band of Canadians, and imprisoned them at Fort Garry, executing one of their number named Scott. Cries of vengeance arose throughout Canada, and thousands of volunteers offered their services. The revolt was finally suppressed in July 1885 by a force under Major-General Middleton. The total force in the field was about 4000 men of the Canadian Militia. Riel was captured, tried, condemned to death, and executed.

In 1886 the coping-stone was placed upon Sir John Macdonald's "National Policy" by the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway across the entire continent to the Pacific. The first through train left Montreal on June 28. A general election took place the same year, and although Sir John Macdonald was again successful at the polls, his majority in the House of Commons was considerably reduced, owing to defections from the party on the Riel rebellion question. On the 15th of February 1888 a treaty for the settlement of the fishery disputes was signed by the British and United States representatives, subject to ratification by the Legislatures of the

respective countries. Sir John Macdonald secured some substantial advantages for Canada in connection with this treaty. In April there was a discussion in the Dominion House of Commons on the subject of commercial union between the United States and Canada. The motion for unrestricted reciprocity was rejected by 124 to 67 votes. The Government amendment carried was to the effect that Canada was desirous, in the future as in the past, of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States, in so far as it might not conflict with the national policy of Canada. Sir John Macdonald's Government were also successful about this time in conciliating the agitation for the abolition of the monopoly clauses in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act by a compromise satisfactory to Manitoba.

The deceased statesman was confronted with a serious religious difficulty in 1889, in consequence of the anti-Jesuit agitation. The Jesuits were incorporated by the Quebec legislature in 1887, and in 1888 an Act was passed voting $400,000 as compensation for their confiscated estates held by the Crown. The Federal Government was petitioned to disallow the Act, but declined. A motion for disallowance was thrown out by the Dominion Parliament by a vote of 188 to 13. Lord Stanley of Preston, the Governor-General, was next appealed to, but he refused to veto the measure, which the law officers of the Home Government had pronounced constitutional and within the powers of the Quebec legislature. The agitation still continued, however. Relations with the United States were also somewhat strained. The rejection of the Fishery Treaty by the United States Senate left that vexed question open; but the Canadian authorities, acting in concert with the Newfoundland Government, agreed to continue the *modus vivendi*, and grant licenses to American fishermen. The continued seizure of Canadian sealing vessels by United States revenue cutters in Behring Sea roused deep indignation throughout Canada, but an open rupture between the two countries was averted.

A vote of censure upon Sir John Macdonald's Government for not submitting the constitutionality of the Jesuits Estates Act to the Supreme Court of Canada was rejected in Parliament by 130 votes to 32. The Dominion Parliament passed Acts increasing the customs duties, especially on fruit, flour, plants, and meats; providing a bounty of $2 per ton on pig iron from

native ore ; and amending the Banking Act so as to set up a guarantee fund for the redemption of the notes of insolvent banks. As the M'Kinley Tariff Bill threatened to prevent the export of Canadian barley to the United States, usually amounting to $6,500,000 annually, the Dominion Government imported 10,000 bushels of the two-rowed variety of barley from England, as seed for farmers to grow it for the English market.

The circumstances of the last general election this spring are fresh in the public memory. The farmers of Ontario and Quebec—the most important provinces of Canada—had suffered severely for some years, and the M'Kinley Tariff now made their position almost intolerable by shutting their produce out of the United States. The Liberals proposed a scheme of unrestricted reciprocity, by which Canada could send her wares into the United States free of duty, and could receive American wares free of duty in return. The plan was very popular in certain districts, and as the task of Government had become irksome and surrounded by difficulties, Sir John Macdonald dissolved Parliament in February. The Premier, in enunciating his policy, asked the farmers to agree to a compromise, by which their produce should be allowed free into the United States, while the manufacturers of the United States should not have a perfectly free market in Canada.

The American Government, however, let it be clearly known that it would not agree to a scheme in which, as alleged, nearly all the benefit would be on Canada's side. On the other hand, the Canadian Premier and his friends maintained that unrestricted reciprocity must lead to annexation, to which they were resolutely opposed. "A British subject I was born," cried Sir John ; "a British subject I will die." The elections were fought out with great bitterness of feeling, charges of treason being brought against the Liberal leaders, Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Laurier, which they indignantly repelled. In the end, while the Government lost ground in Ontario and Quebec, it gained in other districts. The Liberals had counted upon a victory ; but Sir John Macdonald was for the fourth time in succession at a general election triumphant at the polls. It is true that his majority, which was 49 in 1887, was reduced to 34 in 1891, but the latter figure, in a small House of Commons, was considered a sufficiently good working majority. Sir John Macdonald continued in office as Prime Minister and

Minister of Railways and Canals, but his health was impaired by his great exertions during the contest, and the end has come within three months. One of his latest acts of policy was to subsidise a line of Pacific steamers in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

As a Parliamentary leader, Sir John Macdonald exhibited great abilities in debate, in general affairs, and in political tactics. He was very frequently a delegate to England and to other countries on public business, and he always executed his delicate diplomatic missions with singular tact and skill. He bore so strong a facial resemblance to Lord Beaconsfield that he was styled "the Canadian Disraeli," and there was likewise a considerable similarity between their views of statesmanship. An "old Parliamentary hand" unmatched in Dominion politics, he excited among his followers a devotion which was invaluable to the Conservative party in keeping together the various groups of which it was composed. In the course of his long political career he carried to a successful issue many measures of the highest importance, in addition to those already enumerated in this article. Conspicuous amongst these measures may be cited the improvement of the criminal laws of Canada ; the consolidation of the statutes ; the extension of the municipal system ; military organisation ; the establishment of a direct steam mail communication with Europe ; the inspection of reformatories, prisons, penitentiaries, and asylums ; the reorganisation of the Civil Service on a permanent basis ; the construction of the Inter-Colonial and the Canadian Pacific railways ; the enlargement of the canals ; the enactment of a stringent election law ; the extension of the franchise ; the ratification of the Washington Treaty; and the extension and consolidation of the Dominion.

Sir John Macdonald was twice married—first to Isabella, daughter of Mr. Alexander Clark, of Dalnavert, Inverness-shire, who died in 1856 ; and, secondly, to Susan Agnes, daughter of the Hon. T. J. Bernard, member of Her Majesty's Privy Council of Jamaica. Lady Macdonald is known as a writer for periodicals. Sir John resided at Kingston during the recess, and at Earnscliffe, Ottawa, during the Parliamentary Session. He was a member of the Rideau (Ottawa) and Toronto Yacht Clubs, and also of the London Athenæum Club.

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL

1819–1891

OBITUARY NOTICE, THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 1891

THE news of the death of Mr. James Russell Lowell will be read with deep sorrow in every English-speaking country. In America it will be felt that one of the chief stars of its firmament has disappeared. Here many will know that they have lost a friend not to be replaced, and that the republic of letters is to-day very much poorer than it was while this bright, versatile, sweet, prolific spirit lived.

In common with so much of the flower of American life, Mr. Lowell was of Puritan origin. He was the heir of several generations of men of plain living and high thinking, and pious ways; the outcome of a line of eminent divines, munificent philanthropists, and enterprising manufacturers. The best blood of Massachusetts was in his veins. His ancestors, who came from Bristol, had settled in Massachusetts in the seventeenth century, and the Russells and the Lowells had always been men of worth and mark in the State. The poet's father, Dr. Charles Lowell, was a cultivated Unitarian clergyman, fond of books, and a lover of the old ways. His wife, Harriet Spence, was a lady of unusual parts. James Russell Lowell, the youngest of five children, was born on 22nd February 1819 at Cambridge, Massachusetts. Many lines in his poems give glimpses of his early home; and in his essays he often dwells with loving tenderness over the memories of his birthplace, then a pretty, quiet country village, with "a few houses, chiefly old, around the bare common, with ample elbow room, and old women, capped and spectacled, still peered through the same windows

from which they had watched Lord Percy's artillery rumble by to Lexington," and where before the quaint inns you might see "great white-topped waggons, each drawn by double files of six or eight horses, with its dusty bucket swung from the hinder axle, bull-dog silent underneath."

Elmwood, his home, was an old pre-revolutionary house, full of books, pictures, and ancestral portraits. In this atmosphere of purity and culture, where the talk was of literature or weightier matters, of the Federal Bank, Clay's or Calhoun's last speech, Channing's last sermons and essays, or Scott's last novel, and where stern protests against slavery were uttered by the hearth, grew up the poet, critic, and militant abolitionist. At sixteen he went to Harvard. The ordinary studies of the University had no charm for him. He read widely in a desultory fashion. He entered the Law School and took his degree of LL.B., and actually opened an office as a lawyer in Boston. But he did not seriously attempt to practise.

Literature was his early passion, and it soon absorbed him. Before his 22nd year he had published a volume of poems, neither better nor worse than most juvenile productions, very melancholy and very musical, with the characteristically youthful motto, "*Ich habe gelebt und geliebet.*" The *Pioneer*, a praiseworthy adventure of the young poet and his friend, Robert Carter, made but a short voyage. It made shipwreck after three numbers had appeared, though Hawthorne, Whittier, and Story, and Mrs. Barrett Browning were among the contributors. A great advance was discernible; it was clear that America possessed another poet, when, in 1844, the volume containing "A Legend of Brittany," "The Shepherd of King Admetus," and "Prometheus" appeared. Here also were too many imitated tones. The practised ear detected echoes of Keats and Wordsworth. But true native notes were struck. If rhetoric predominated, it was noble rhetoric, and the thoughts of the young poet moved in a high region to sweet music. He who had lingered with manifest delight over "Endymion" spoke with the austerity of Whittier or Garrison about the problems and duties of his day. The want of actuality so characteristic of the Percivals and Sigourneys, Hallecks, and other tame American poets of that time, was not his fault,—

> The poet's song with blood-warm truth was rife.

Had Mr. Lowell written no more than "A Legend of Brittany" —beautiful as "the illuminated marge of some old book"—he would have taken a high place among the poets of his country. But in 1848 he made a great advance; he stepped at once into the front rank of writers, and opened a rich, fresh vein by the publication of the *Biglow Papers*. Destined, we can scarcely doubt, to be permanent parts of literature, they could have appeared at no other time. They were suggested by the Mexican War, which he, in common with the most scrupulous of his countrymen, believed to be "a war of false pretences," and a theatre for the display of some of the worst and meanest passions. The best minds of the north were becoming impatient of the tyranny of the south, incredulous of the pompous arguments, and sick of the hypocrisy, with which slavery was supported; and Hosea Biglow gave sharp, pungent expression to a general feeling. "What Mr. Robinson thinks," "The Debate in the Sennit," "The Pious Editor's Creed," "A Letter from a Candidate," had effects which it is difficult now to conceive. The idle and frivolous remembered only such verses as—

> But John P.
> Robinson he
> Sez they didn't know everythin' down in Judee.

> I du believe in Freedom's cause,
> Ez fur away ez Paryis is;
> I love to see her stick her claws
> In them infarnal Pharyisees;
> It's wal enough agin a king
> To dror resolves an' triggers,
> But libbaty's a kind o' thing
> Thet don't agree with niggers.

Grave men lingered over such strong, inspiring words as these—

> O strange New World, thet yit wast never young,
> Whose youth from thee by gripin' need was wrung,
> Brown foundlin' o' the woods, whose baby-bed
> Was prowled roun' by the Injun's cracklin' tread,
> An' who grew'st strong thru' shifts, an' wants an' pains,
> Nussed by stern men with empires in their brains,
> Who saw in vision their young Ishmel strain
> With each hard hand a vassal ocean's mane,
> Thou, skilled by Freedom an' by great events
> To pitch new States ez Old-World men pitch tents,

Thou, taught by Fate to know Jehovah's plan
Thet man's devices can't unmake a man,
An' whose free latch-string never was drawed in
Against the poorest child of Adam's kin,—
The grave 's not dug where traitor hands shall lay
In fearful haste thy murdered corse away!

The letters had no mere literary success; they are to be compared rather with the Drapier Letters than with the satire of Pope or Dryden. The whole rhetorical stock-in-trade of many eminent politicians became at one blow unsaleable. The laugh was turned against the Southern "chivalry." The "fanatics," as the Abolitionists were called even in New England, were at one stroke transformed into reasonable men, irreconcilable to impossible compromises; and the end of "the sacred institution," it was plain, was not far off. Fastidious people, such as Charles Sumner, might complain that the book was not written in good English. Better critics knew that it could not be other than it was. The Yankee dialect was the natural speech of the satirist—

I *ken* write long-tailed, ef I please—
But when I'm jokin', no, I thankee;
Then, 'fore I know it, my idees
Run helter-skelter into Yankee.

In fact, the book grew spontaneously. To a Boston newspaper Lowell sent the first of Hosea Biglow's contributions. The public laughed, and eagerly demanded more. He wrote another letter, and, before perhaps he well knew what his plan was, he had given literature an imperishable treasure, never to be imitated. The America of Birdofredum Sawin has passed away; it is faithfully preserved for ever in the *Biglow Papers*. About the beginning of the civil war Mr. Lowell published a second series of *Biglow Papers*. Some of them were excellent; for example, "Jonathan to John," beginning—

It don't seem hardly right, John,
When both my hands was full,
To stump me to a fight, John,—
Your cousin, tu, John Bull!

But the flavour of the second series was not quite so racy as that of the first. The incomparable success could not be repeated. He himself said, in his own moderate, modest way

—"Friendly people say to me sometimes, 'Write us more Biglow Papers,' and I have even been foolish enough to try, only to find that I could not. This has helped to persuade me that the book was a genuine growth, and not a manufacture." Witty though he was, he has said that he never used the mask of Momus, except to command attention to serious thoughts; and it is characteristic of the man that his next works were his poems, "The Vision of Sir Launfal" and "The Present Crisis," conceived in a lofty strain, which set to music the gravest resolves of the sternest spirits of New England, and which have since furnished with inspiring texts every religious and social reformer. "A Fable for Critics," published anonymously in 1848, obtained for him another success, whether a durable one is more doubtful. Loud were the cries of indignation from the crowd of poetasters who had squatted down on the highest peak of Parnassus, and whom, with a good-natured shove, he pushed off into their proper place on the flat below. The "Fable" did its work. It introduced a due sense of proportion into American criticism. It put an end to those dull times, when, to use his own words, "to write a hundred blank verses was to be immortal till somebody else wrote a hundred and fifty blanker," and pruned, with good effect, the too luxuriant growth of "remarkable" men of letters in every community big enough to maintain a grocery store or a newspaper. Curious—though by no means adequate, or the most brilliant passage in a brilliant satire—is Lowell's account of himself—

> There is Lowell, who's striving Parnassus to climb
> With a whole bale of *isms* tied together with rhyme,
> He might get on alone, spite of brambles and boulders,
> But he can't with that bundle he has on his shoulders,
> The top of the hill he will ne'er come nigh reaching
> Till he learns the distinction 'twixt singing and preaching;
> His lyre has some chords that would ring pretty well,
> But he'd rather by half make a drum of the shell,
> And rattle away till he's old as Methusalem,
> At the head of a march to the last new Jerusalem.

In 1855 he was appointed, in succession to Longfellow, to the Chair of Modern Languages and Belles-Lettres at Harvard. He went abroad for two years, to live chiefly in Germany and Italy, there to widen still further his knowledge of modern literature. He returned to Cambridge in 1857, and his work

as a professor was varied by lecturing at the Lowell Institute, the publication of "Fireside Travels,"—in the opinion of many of his admirers the best of his prose writings,—and the task of editing the *Atlantic Monthly*, which, under his skilful guidance, did much for the literature of his country. "Under the Willows," containing more than one charming poem, appeared in 1869. Perhaps on some of the products of this time, full of subtle feeling and exquisite susceptibility to nature's tenderer aspects, the admirers of Mr. Lowell would linger with most delight. In his Commemoration Ode, "dedicated to the ever sweet and shining memory of the ninety-three sons of Harvard College who have died for their country in the war of nationality," he once more was the chosen spokesman of the deepest thoughts of his countrymen. We cannot perhaps value his odes as highly as they do; they are for them robed in personal associations of sorrow and glory, which to Englishmen must be invisible. But no one can read them unmoved; they were the fit expression of a nation's grief.

In an early work entitled "Conversations," Lowell had given the world a taste of his quality as a critic; and, as editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* and the *North American Review*, he wrote many fine critical essays. His full strength and richness as such were revealed to us all only in the essays published between 1870 and 1876. "My Study Windows" and "Among my Books" are in all hands. Wherever literature is loved, wherever learning and appreciation of what is beautiful and good are held in honour, these delightful fruits of a full life are prized. It is easy to find defects in him as a critic. Half of his faults, however, are due to exuberance of wit and fancy; the other half are perhaps ascribable to overkindliness. With all their blemishes, these essays take rank with the very best of Hazlitt's, and scarcely fall short of the masterpieces of Lamb. No man ever wrote less bookishly and more delightfully about books; none of his generation could distil more skilfully the subtle aroma of the finest literature. An eclectic, no simple product of his own New England, he was. Many minds, the rich washings of many streams, ores from far countries, and the dust of diamonds bequeathed by the past, imparted to his style its iridescence and sparkle. Only parochial Aristarchuses, proud of their native poverty of outfit, were disposed to cheapen such riches.

From his congenial life in Cambridge Lowell was called in 1877 to become minister at Madrid; and in 1880 he succeeded Mr. Welsh as representative of the United States in England. The successful poet, the accomplished critic, the erudite scholar, proved himself a skilful diplomatist. He gave offence to politicians who wanted "a fresh deal," and who complained that, in regard to the "American suspects," he did not use the exact sort of language which would have pleased the Majesty of Tammany. The best of his countrymen were confident that their interests were not the less safe in his hands because he acted with the tact of a well-bred man of the world. No foreign representative was ever more respected and admired than Mr. Lowell. Without sacrificing the interests of his country, he was the favourite of all classes, with the single exception of the Irish malcontents. His was an embassy of culture and good-will. We prized his counsels and criticisms of England, even if pungently expressed. We rejoiced in his refined, humorous speech. An admirable public speaker, he was the soul and life of a congenial company; and he was more interesting still in a *tête-à-tête*. We could not have been prouder of him had he been one of us. It was always a moot question whether he was more an Englishman than an American. It will never be settled, perhaps because he united or represented the best qualities of both nations. Here he made warm friends and he kept them; and his departure from England, on the change of administration in 1885, was regarded as a calamity, for which his yearly visits to us were but partial compensation. He was the last person to speak of what he had done in public life, and some of his countrymen were too disposed to be critical of him in his capacity as a politician. And yet his conduct from first to last will bear scrutiny as will that of few others.

Of his "Political Essays," lately reprinted, the first is dated 1858; it is an eloquent protest against the doctrine, then supreme, that slavery ought to be outside the range of public discussion. The latest, dated 1888, is a plea for the toleration of the Independent in politics and for an educated and permanent Civil Service, and is a protest against the tyranny of Bosses, those "flesh flies that fatten on the sores of our body politic." The interval between these dates is filled with arguments, manly, fervent, and pointed, for every honest cause in

American politics which needed a helping hand in trying times.

Since he returned to America he has published a volume of poems and political essays full of bold criticism and wise counsel, both remarkable works, worthy of founding a reputation if written by any but him. Only a short time ago he edited with loving hand "Izaak Walton"; and in his poem lately published in the *Atlantic Monthly*, "How I consulted the Oracle of the Goldfishes," are beautiful lines upon the old text—

> What know we of the world immense
> Beyond the narrow ring of sense?

It is much too soon to predict the verdict of posterity. His many friends may await it with confidence. He upon whom was showered so much success laboured under one constant disadvantage—his versatility and many-sidedness lessened his reputation. The mountain, which has far-reaching spurs sloping gently into the valleys, seems to a careless eye so much smaller than the peak, really a dwarf in comparison, shooting out of the plain. His culture was so wide, the hospitality of his mind so generous. He loved the warm sunshine and fresh nature of Chaucer; it did not prevent him from writing the best essay in the language on Dryden; his study of Lessing—a kindred spirit—is perhaps the great critic's most satisfactory biography; and he could not speak of Dante, Shakespeare, Keats, or Browning, without saying things, if not unsaid before, never said so well. His vision ranged with easy glance from Concord to Weimar, from Stratford to Florence, and to some minds it was natural to question his originality, while admitting his learning. Certain people always delight to praise the duckweed of the ditch, just because of its origin, at the expense of the full-blown flower, the product of nature and art. Posterity corrects such mistakes; it is apt to think cheaply of that originality, the first and almost only condition of which is ignorance. Certainly Lowell had many of the qualities calculated to secure lasting fame; and we cannot believe that such gems as "The Courtin'," "The Present Crisis," or the best parts of the *Biglow Papers*, will perish. He had the gift of what he himself called "fame's great antiseptic style." He had an open eye for the subtle aspects of nature. He had a sympathy with

the abiding aspirations of men ; and, not least, his was the friendship of many who will do their best to preserve the memory of his rich gifts and rare soul. He will not lie in Westminster, as some of us would have wished. Wherever he sleeps, two nations sincerely mourn him.

JULES GRÉVY

1807–1891

OBITUARY NOTICE, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1891

THE date of the birth of M. Jules Grévy has always been in doubt, and to-day some say he was born in 1807, others in 1813. According to information, however, that I have taken from the *Temps*, friends of his who dwell in the Jura, and who knew him well, state that it was in 1807, and not in 1813, that he was born at Mont-sous-Vaudrey, where he has just died, and where undoubtedly he will be buried. Neither his family nor the Republican party would wish at this moment to try the experiment of burying him in Paris, where, moreover, the question of the presence or the absence of the Ministers from the Catholic service would take an acute form, whatever may be the feeling or decision of the family upon this point at Mont-sous-Vaudrey. It is thus that this absentee, whom people had begun already to forget, although he was the first Republican President of the Third Republic, now so prosperous, will repose in the solitude where he died, and, when the present generation has disappeared, this first Republican President will be almost as unknown to the generation that follows as the first of the Pharaohs. However, the Republican papers, which now for some four years have associated him with the continuous attacks that were then heaped upon him by the Boulangists and their associates,—the Republican papers which have insulted him or stood by in silence at his fall,—to-day weep crocodile tears over his corpse, and stretch their generosity so far as to pardon him for the evil they had done him and the bitterness they have poured upon his last days.

The truth is that M. Jules Grévy deserved neither this excess of honour nor this indignity, neither the insults of the past nor the exalted panegyrics of to-day. He was always, from the very first period of his life, a strong Republican, and, indeed, when one became acquainted with him one knew that he must be a Republican and could not be anything else. His life, his customs, his whole atmosphere, his tastes—everything carried him in the direction of this political party, in which his uprightness, his calm seriousness of character, which gave the impression of austerity, soon placed him, not at the head—for he had the narrow political views of the man of the fields—but, if I may so say, on the front façade, as it were, of the Republic, where he produced an ornamental effect of high and precious value. And there, as always and everywhere, one distinctive trait dominated M. Jules Grévy — an absolute egoism, on which hung all his qualities, all his capabilities, all his actions, and all his convictions. Capable only of being Republican, being able to find his place only in a Republic, his Republican conviction was magnified by his personal obligation. He would certainly have defended the Republic at any cost, but he defended it all the more, as it was obliged to serve him as much, at least, as he served it, up to the moment when the Republicans felt that it was serving him too much.

Having come to Paris to study law, M. Grévy was enrolled on the list of advocates in 1837, at the age of thirty. He soon defended some insurgents, and in 1839 became the advocate of the Republican opposition, and enlisted from this moment in the Liberal, Democratic, insurrectionary, and Republican party. He found himself, naturally enough, designated to be sent to the Jura, his native country, as Commissary of the Republic in 1848. The Jura sent him to the Constituent Assembly, where his slow, reflective, and serious character, a little heavy perhaps, before long placed him at the head of the party, so sincerely Republican, which strengthened this Chamber. His countryman's sense did not deceive him for long. He understood that, in allowing the President to be appointed by universal suffrage, the way was being opened for Cæsarism, and, although not yet clearly seeing who would be the Cæsar, he anticipated that the man chosen by universal suffrage—that is to say, having for himself alone as many votes as the entire Assembly—would try to make himself master of the Assembly, and would make the

Republic bow to the exigencies of his own personal ambition. Not knowing how to anticipate the danger before an Assembly, which, from instinct or conscience, was resigning itself to Cæsarism, he thought of suppressing the Presidency altogether, and substituting for it a President of the Council, appointed indefinitely by the Chambers or by the Chamber, and always revocable by one or both. He thought that the only way in which he could turn the Chamber from the idea of election by universal suffrage was by showing it how to dispose of the executive power, while still retaining the legislative power—that is to say, by making it the absolute and unique power, without restriction or balance weight. It was a method springing from a careful and a dangerous egoism, and the remedy was worse than the evil.

This project was seen closer at hand later on, upon M. Jules Grévy's elevation to the Presidency of the Republic, and the position then was considered a strange contrast—the fact of the plan proposed and the destiny of its author. But this contrast did not exist. For what M. Grévy especially fought against was the prospect of seeing the Republic disappear, and not of seeing it exist under a President. His proposition, too radical for the Constituent Assembly, was rejected, and the Legislative Assembly of 1849 was elected. There, of course, with the same instinct which carried him to the defence of the Republic, he made absolute opposition to the policy of Louis Napoleon, combated all the measures proposed by the future author of the *Coup d'État*, and, by his accomplices, voted that sterile proposition authorising the questors to summon directly armed forces (a ridiculous vote, when one remembers how things went at the *Coup d'État*), passed a short time in prison after 2nd September, and defended the Liberal cause, and pleaded many a case for sixteen years until 1868, when, at a time when opposition began to become very serious, he got himself elected. In 1869, at the general election, he was returned unopposed.

He thus formed part of that Chamber which deceived itself, and was deceived, by a show of Liberal policy, and over which M. Emile Ollivier presided with the sincerity of a temperament always convinced. He opposed himself to the *plébiscite* of 1870, which deceived everybody except the Germans, to whom it revealed the exact figure of the French army, and on 4th September he found himself in the Chamber invaded by the Revolution.

He refused to form part of the Government of National Defence —owing to hatred of revolutions, say some ; in order not to disappear with the workers of the first moment, say others ; and not to vie with Gambetta, Jules Simon, and Jules Favre, say others still. It is a point that history will have to decide, if the page be indeed important enough to be filled up. He came back as Deputy of the Jura to the National Assembly of 1871. He had gone through the war in silence, his age preventing him from taking any active part. He had kept himself outside with great discretion. He understood that M. Thiers had the right to the first place. He proposed to offer it to him. The second came to him naturally. It was that of President of the Assembly, and he was chosen to it. He remained there until February 1873.

Then the Conservatives conspired to overturn M. Thiers. They affected to misunderstand the grounds of the authority of M. Jules Grévy, whose Presidency troubled their designs. His friends begged him to remain in any circumstances. But M. Grévy gave in his resignation. Some weeks later on, M. Buffet having succeeded M. Jules Grévy, the Conservative majority began their assault on M. Thiers. It is not known if M. Jules Grévy regretted greatly having hastened the fall of M. Thiers. But the Duc de Broglie, the strongest Ambassador that a Government ever had, left London, returned to France, ascended the tribune, and there violently attacked M. Thiers, whom he represented in London. On 24th May, owing to the conspiracy of M. Buffet, M. Thiers was overthrown. In 1876, in the new elections, the majority became Republican, and M. Jules Grévy went with it. He ascended naturally to the chair. The 16th of May 1877 sent him back to the Presidency of the Chamber. The day when M. Thiers died, M. Grévy, who for seven years had played the second *rôle* in the Republic, found himself without effort invested with the first, and at the fall of Marshal MacMahon he was appointed President of the Republic. It has been said that this post was offered to M. Dufaure. I can affirm that that is false. I have in my possession a letter of M. Dufaure addressed to me, in which he protests against the idea of the offer ever having been made, as a calumny. At the moment when he was carrying to the Assembly the resignation of Marshal MacMahon, I met him, and he said to me with emotion, while speaking of Marshal MacMahon, "I have just

seen a true citizen and an honest man." That was not the language of a man to whom the succession of the Marshal would have been offered.

M. Grévy, as President of the Republic, brought to his position his natural qualities and his natural faults. His nature, which did not love effort, accommodated itself rather to the effaced *rôle* assigned to his office by the Constitution because he wished it so, and he acquitted himself of this *rôle* as head of the State within the narrowest limits possible, not from avarice, as was said of him, but because at the time it was easier and more advantageous. However, when he had triumphed over his adversaries, he feared only Gambetta, and he pretended to regard him as inoffensive. "This young man," he said in 1881 to M. Ribot, now Minister of Foreign Affairs, from whom I have this anecdote, "makes much of himself, but he is much less busied in public affairs than people think. The proof is that he never comes to see me. Never does any one of my Ministers mention his name. There are some who are said to be his friends. That I believe; but that does not prove that they allow themselves to be influenced or directed by him." It was on 8th February 1881 that M. Ribot told me this anecdote. Some months later Gambetta was Prime Minister, and three months afterwards Gambetta had fallen.

In the month of August 1879 some friends of M. de Freycinet begged me to say to M. Grévy that his Ministers did not utilise the admirable qualities of M. de Freycinet, but that they confined him jealously to the Ministry of Public Works. "Yes," replied M. Grévy, "I know that; but they tell me that he is so ambitious that I should make a managing collaborator of him for myself if he were set too far ahead." He consented, however, to speak with him, and three months later M. de Freycinet succeeded M. Waddington as President of the Council. When, in 1887, during the lamentable attacks to which he succumbed, M. de Freycinet refused to form a Cabinet, and submitted his candidature in succession to M. Jules Grévy, the latter said, "They told me truly that I was introducing an enemy into my house."

M. Grévy's address was simple, gracious, and dignified. He did not affect a deep taciturnity, nor did he on the other hand speak out, save when he wished. He was most particularly blamed for his economies, but in truth I believe that he would

have been greatly embarrassed and wearied by the thought of great expenses. He had a great love of peace and a horror of *coups d'état*, and he proved his energy by combating Boulangism.

When in 1887 the question was raised of the selling of decorations, in which M. Wilson was implicated, the egoism of the grandfather who adored his grandchildren, and would not be separated from them, overrode all other considerations, and, not wishing to leave them, it was only force that obliged him thereto. But those who were present on 1st December 1887 in the *couloirs* of the Chamber were permitted to see the strange spectacle of an Assembly which desired to overthrow an old man, and which trembled before him because they supposed him capable of treason against the law, for when the news got abroad that M. Jules Grévy had summoned General Boulanger, there was a frightful panic, which appeared ridiculous when the report was recognisned as false.

I have been obliged to hurry over the *résume* of this life without relief, in which fine shades only must be substituted for the rarity of startling facts. What is certain is that this man directed his life with extreme prudence, and that all his precautions were vain before the great political faint-heartedness to which he succumbed.

To-day there is a pretence of tears, but it must be remembered that no one is deceived, and that M. Jules Grévy dies without exciting any great hates, because he inspires no great admirations. Nobody even at this hour knows who conceived the plan of overturning M. Grévy, nor to whose advantage it was undertaken. It may be that it was done by one of those unreflecting and blind impulses to which the French public are so much inclined. However this may be, certain it is that for the Republic nothing could be more fortunate, and, if it was conceived in the interest of some pretender of anti-Republican aims, it has proved to be a miserable failure. The accession of M. Carnot has strengthened the Republican feeling throughout the country, and given to it great credit abroad. His way of presiding over the triumphant Exhibition of 1889 produced an immensely favourable impression among the visitors of the whole world, and, so far, the fall of M. Grévy, prepared and combined by the enemies of the Republic, has proved to be the happiest event in the eyes of its well-wishers.

FROM A CORRESPONDENT

If M. Jules Grévy had died five years ago, or had declined re-election as President of the French Republic at that time, he would have left a great name in history. He was known for years in France as the type of the honest *bourgeois* politician. He never said a foolish thing. Tall, erect, smooth-shaven, silent at most times, but sententious whenever he did speak, he early persuaded the population of his department, the Jura, that there was something in him. When the revolution that dethroned Louis Philippe suddenly occurred, in 1848, he offered himself as a candidate to the new National Assembly, but before polling day he was appointed Prefect (or Commissioner-General, as the official was then called) for his native department. During his brief tenure of office he won golden opinions, by persecuting nobody and endeavouring in a quiet way to persuade the people of the Jura that they must become tolerant religiously and politically. He stopped several riots by simply going among the people and telling them that in vindication of their grievances they must argue and not fight. Elected to the National Assembly, he abruptly rose to higher flights, and declared that the Republican form of government was indispensable to the perfect evolution of democratic progress. Having said this, coolly, gravely, and weightily, he moved that the new French Republic should be governed by an elective council without any President. Grévy's name, as the rallying point of Republicans who desired no President, became thenceforth notorious, and for a short time his views as to the governing of a country without any ruler were accepted throughout France as the revelation of a new gospel.

Then came the *Coup d'État* of 1851, which relegated Grévy to a short term of imprisonment, and a number of his disciples to exile at Cayenne. But when he was released from prison he saw that it was of no use to wage war against the Third Napoleon, and so returned simply to his practice at the Bar. Other men let themselves be transported or shot. Grévy, abhorring violence, especially when there was a chance of his suffering by it, kept to a prudent, steady, and even course, which caused even his adversaries to treat him with respect. He had won a reputation as an orator, yet he never opened his mouth

except to speak for clients who employed him in non-political suits. To journalists, revolutionists, and other noisy people in conflict with the Imperial laws, he turned a deaf ear. He espoused no causes which were calculated to bring him any unpleasantness; and so it came to pass that in 1868 his fellow-countrymen in the Jura once more looked upon him as the "safest man" to send to the Corps Législatif. He took his seat, but said nothing, though he always voted with the Opposition. He was regarded as a mysterious man, taciturn, but true to the core. The Empire fell, and in the first Assembly that was elected after the peace of 1871 he was named among the Republican party as the man who ought to be President of the Chamber or of the Republic. Nobody exactly liked him, but everybody respected him. He did no lobbying and asked no man for his vote, and compromised himself by no speeches.

His day came, and he was elected President of the Chamber. Nobody ever presided over a turbulent assembly more impartially; and one day, all of a sudden, this cool, grave man gave proof of the finest civic courage. Marshal MacMahon, having the Duc de Broglie as his Prime Minister, dissolved the Chamber without any reason, and proceeded to organise a general election, which was intended to bring the Republic to destruction. It was an anxious time, but, on the last day when the Chamber met, President Grévy, in a calm voice, and quietly stroking his white beard, uttered these words—"In dismissing this Chamber, I wish to say that it has never, during its too brief career, ceased for one moment to merit the esteem and the confidence of the country." The surprised and frantic cheers which greeted these brave words proclaimed M. Jules Grévy "the man" of the Republican party. The conspiracy hatched by the Duc de Broglie failed, and Marshal MacMahon, disgusted with office-holding, soon sent for M. Jules Grévy and announced himself ready to resign power into his hands under certain guarantees. M. Grévy, in dulcet tones, refused to give any guarantees whatsoever, and the end of the matter was that the Marshal resigned without any conditions, saying, "Vous êtes un honnête homme; j'ai confiance en vous!"

Certainly M. Grévy was an honest man, and in politics a thorough Liberal. He hated persecutions and intolerance of all sorts. An enthusiastic billiard player, he invited to the Elysée all who could join him at that game, and among the guests

came M. Paul de Cassagnac, the Bonapartist, to the great scandal of all Republicans who were neither Liberal nor tolerant. It has been said that M. Grévy was niggardly in his expenditure. The real truth is that he was careful. Separated from his wife by incompatibilities of temper, he had his daughter to keep house for him ; but this young lady, who had been brought up in thoroughly *bourgeois* ways, never quite understood her father's position. In course of time she married a M. Wilson, and M. Grévy, who felt sincere affection for his son-in-law, gradually allowed himself to be guided by him. He himself, being a keen sportsman, shot all day during the game season and played billiards in the evening. It was M. Daniel Wilson who interviewed Ministers and other State officials for him, and it may be noted that M. Wilson, having a horror of capital punishment, prevailed upon his father-in-law to pardon, or commute the sentence of, most of the abominable scoundrels who were sentenced to death under M. Grévy's presidency. For the rest, M. Grévy was perfectly correct in all his presidential conduct. He quarrelled with nobody, kept open house, and was so civil to all the politicians who clustered to his daily *déjeuners*, that, contrary to his own wish, these gentlemen caused him to be re-elected at the end of his seven years' term.

This re-election was a great mistake from the Republican point of view. It amounted practically to saying that, at the end of M. Grévy's term, there was nobody, in a nation of 35,000,000 persons, ready to take the place of a benevolent and undistinguished old gentleman. But this admission was tantamount to a surrender to monarchical principle, and this was so well felt by M. Grévy's son-in-law that he at once set himself to play the part of a Crown Prince, apparently trusting that his rule would last for ever. Everybody remembers how M. Wilson collapsed, through the illicit traffic in certain decorations ; but a general feeling of pity and regret followed M. Grévy into his enforced retirement. If it had not been for family influences, M. Grévy would have held his position as President of the Republic worthily to the end—all the more so, as he had nothing to do but to remain as he always was, quiet and indifferent on all matters touching contentious politics, and coolly alive to all purely personal interests.

GENERAL BOULANGER

1837–1891

OBITUARY NOTICE, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1891

THE suicide of General Boulanger brings to a dramatic and, we might almost say, appropriate close one of the most extraordinary careers that modern European history has seen. On 7th January 1886, the day of his appointment to the Ministry of War in one of M. de Freycinet's numerous Cabinets, our Paris correspondent wrote with perfect truth, "General Boulanger and Admiral Aube (the Minister of Marine) are unknown to fame." A little later his energy began to tell, and men thought it worth while to look into his military record, which was found to be singularly honourable. In little more than two years he was at the head of a party, and carried, by a great majority, the election in the Département du Nord—one of the most important constituencies in France. His cause, thriving because of its indefiniteness, made rapid progress, and on 27th January 1889, on a vacancy occurring in the then undivided constituency of Paris, the General carried it by a majority so overwhelming that, if he had chosen to strike, it is pretty certain that France would have been at his feet. Yet in two months and five days from that time he had fled the country, under the threat of arrest, to the utter discomfiture of his friends and the ruin of his cause; and after being senteneed *in contumaciam* for all kinds of offences against the State, and after the most damaging revelations had been published, involving persons and parties much more important than himself, he now, played out and penniless, blows his brains out upon his mistress's grave.

Georges Ernest Jean Marie Boulanger was born at Rennes on

29th April 1837. On leaving the military school of St. Cyr in 1856, he became sous-lieutenant in an Algerian regiment, and very soon saw active service in the expedition against the Kabyles. He was badly wounded by a ball in the chest at the skirmish of Turbigo, in the Italian war of 1859, and obtained the cross of the Legion of Honour. In 1861 he was sent to Cochin China, where more fighting was going on, and again he was wounded, this time by a lance-thrust in the leg. In 1862, after only six years' service, he became captain, and was presently appointed to the post of *commandant de compagnie* at St. Cyr. When the war of 1870 broke out he became *chef de bataillon;* and, as his regiment formed part of the army of Paris, he did not take part in the first disastrous battles. He was very active throughout the first portion of the siege, and at the terrible battle of Champigny, being then lieutenant-colonel, his shoulder was broken by a ball. Again he recovered, and was able to take part in the second siege of Paris ; and again was wounded, a ball striking him on the elbow, at one of the last barricades. He became colonel in 1874, and brigadier-general in 1880 ; and, as is not uncommon in the French army, he applied for a command in an arm that was new to him, the cavalry, and exercised it for some months with much distinction.

In 1881 he was selected to be the chief of the mission sent by France to congratulate the Americans on the centenary of Yorktown ; and there, it is said, that charm of manner which afterwards counted for so much towards his brief success as the head of a party was generally acknowledged. When he returned he went back to his cavalry command, but on 16th May 1882 he was nominated Director of Infantry at the War Office in Paris. This important appointment brought him to the centre of things, and gave him scope for the exercise of his very real energy, which at that time was directed to reforms that were generally applauded. Probably the General's cousin, M. Clémenceau, afterwards his persistent opponent, had something to do with suggesting several of them. He made himself almost indispensable at the War Office, and was retained at his post by successive and very dissimilar Ministers of War—Generals Thibaudin and Campenon.

In 1884 Boulanger was made General of Division, and went to command the army occupying Tunis. Here his energy was remarkable, and, not for the first time, he gave signs of that

disposition to ignore the civil power which afterwards led to such serious results. An Italian, who had struck a French officer, was, as he thought, insufficiently punished; and Boulanger issued a fiery order of the day. M. Cambon, the French agent, protested, and General Boulanger soon afterwards resigned. But his retirement was brief, for on 7th January 1886 he was appointed Minister of War in M. de Freycinet's new Cabinet, one of his colleagues, the Minister of Finance, being the M. Sadi Carnot, who at present holds sway at the Elysée, having been elected in 1888 to combat Boulangism. It is noteworthy that on the day after Boulanger was appointed he issued an order of the day to the troops recommending "that absolute co-operation which is based on those sentiments of duty, obedience, and devotion, of which the army has given so many proofs." Very soon his personality began to make itself felt. The Extreme Left were working in its favour, influenced in part by the relationship and friendship of M. Clémenceau towards the new Minister; and the reforms which the General was carrying out secured him a certain backing among neutral people, who merely wished to see the French army strong.

But what especially brought Boulanger to the fore was his conduct with regard to the expulsion of the Orleans Princes—conduct which makes the subsequent conduct of the Comte de Paris one of the almost incredible facts of contemporary history. General Boulanger was relentless in his action towards the Princes. He fought a duel with Baron Lareinty in consequence of it; he used strong language and acted strongly. The discovery of some letters in which, years before, he had covered the Duc d'Aumale with fulsome praise only seemed to make him all the more popular with the mob; and his denial of the letters (which he was afterwards compelled to retract) made him the hero of the hour. Then began the curious and humiliating spectacle of a French General and War Minister stooping to catch the voices of the *cafés-chantants*. He came—especially after the Schnaebele incident—to be regarded as at once the General of *la revanche* and the organiser of democratic military reform. The music-halls re-echoed with songs in his honour, in the singing of which one M. Paulus, a *café-chantant* celebrity, made the most impression. The law for imposing a universal term of three years' military service instead of five, with exceptions, made in his favour; and when first the Freycinet Cabinet

and then the Goblet Cabinet fell, there were loud and threatening demands for him to remain at the Ministry of War. When M. Rouvier became Premier, at midsummer, Boulanger was not included in the new Cabinet; and all the *gamins* of Paris immediately struck up the song with the refrain—

C'est Boulange, lange, lange,
C'est Boulanger, qu'il nous faut.

The return of the General to the War Office became a question of street politics. Everywhere were seen pictures of him and his famous black horse; everywhere the song, "Il reviendra" was heard. But sober people saw a danger in all this, and M. Clémenceau himself had said, "Le Général aime trop la popularité." It was soon after this that M. Jules Ferry, in a speech, called Boulanger "un Saint-Arnaud de café-concert"—a mortal affront, which Boulanger was determined, if possible, to wipe out in the blood of a man whose destruction would have endeared him more than ever to the Parisian mob. The conditions of the duel which he insisted upon were so barbarous that M. Ferry's seconds broke off the affair.

By this time it was evident that Boulanger was ready for any kind of unconstitutional opposition to the existing state of things. Several groups of people began to regard him as a useful instrument for their schemes, avowed or unavowed; M. Déroulède and his "Ligue des Patriotes"; M. Rochefort and his miscellaneous "Intransigeants," whose destructive aims were expressed by the paper of that name; and, behind, the more important elements of the Royalists and the money of their Prince. The struggle between M. Grévy's Ministers and the General began to be acute. When the Caffarel-Limouzin scandal began, he deliberately charged the Minister of War with maliciously getting it up in order to divert attention from him, Boulanger; and he was promptly ordered under close arrest at Clermont-Ferrand for thirty days. That gave strength and time to his friends, and "manifestations" became frequent. His return to Paris was dreaded by the authorities, who knew how easily a dangerous insurrection may come about in that excitable city. But nothing happened; the Presidential election took place; and, with a new man at the head of affairs, the Republic set itself to fight the dangerous Pretender.

In February 1888 came some partial elections, the country

being then under the system of *scrutin de liste* which Gambetta's perilous tactics had imposed upon it. The Boulangists, reinforced with money from the Duchesse d'Uzès and from the Comte de Paris himself, started their man in many constituencies, and worked the *réclame* most perfectly. He was largely voted for, and in the Dordogne—an old Bonapartist department—was returned by 59,000 votes. This was bad; but worse followed when, in April, a vacancy occurred in the busy manufacturing department of the Nord, and when, after great efforts and great excitement, the General, with a "Revisionist" and "National" programme, carried the seat by 172,528 votes against a much smaller number for his respectable antagonist. Three months of exciting intrigue and "demonstrations" followed, and then, in July, the career of the General was very nearly brought to an end. In the Chamber on 12th July he used an "unparliamentary expression" to M. Floquet—called him a liar, in fact—and a duel followed. Strange to say, one of M. Floquet's seconds was M. Clémenceau; stranger still, the civilian got the better of the fight and dealt his adversary a dangerous wound in the neck, between the carotid artery and the jugular vein. A civilian of sixty years old thus nearly to kill the soldier—the embodiment of the military hopes of all the fire-eaters of France! It was against all precedent, and, as was not unnatural, it damaged the General's popularity for a while. But he recovered from both wounds, the physical and the moral, and during the last months of the year his position became stronger and stronger.

In October the marriage of his daughter—who remained with him when certain domestic scandals divided the household—was made the occasion of what the Boulangists called "an apotheosis"; and at intervals there were banquets, speeches, manifestoes. Then, late in January 1889, came the vacancy in the representation of Paris. It was Boulanger's great chance, and he accepted it, though when fortune had been kind to him beyond all expectation he did not know what use to make of her favours. His opponent was a decent nobody, a M. Jacques, a Republican of the normal kind. The efforts made on both sides were prodigious. The whole of Paris was covered with posters: there were meetings everywhere; the Boulangist journals, many of them created for the occasion, were like leaves in Vallombrosa. It was said, probably with

truth, that £80,000 of the Boulangist money was spent in this election alone. Yet the money would have been well spent, from the Boulangist point of view, if the General had known what to do with his victory. He polled 245,236 votes, against 162,875 for M. Jacques and 27,000 for other candidates. Why did he not at once march upon the Elysée? A little more of the money spent upon the guard would have secured his success; and Napoleon III. would have found a successor. But the General did nothing. His friends shouted and exulted and conferred; but he had not the brains and they had not the singleness of purpose to make their victory effectual. How could they? What unity of intention or of aim, when things began to pass from the destructive to the constructive stage, could there be between M. Thiébaud and the Duchesse d'Uzès, between M. Rochefort and the Comte de Paris?

The only result of the Paris election was the overthrow of M. Floquet's Government and the succession of M. Tirard, with the tacitly acknowledged programme of putting down Boulangism. M. Tirard had a strong colleague in M. Constans, the Minister of the Interior, and it was upon him that the brunt of the battle fell. He began by suppressing the League of Patriots and prosecuting M. Déroulède and his friends. He followed up this successful stroke by another. He frightened Boulanger with the threat, very cleverly conveyed to him, of arrest, and perhaps of worse; and, to the bewilderment and disgust of all the party—of MM. Naquet, Laguerre, Laisant, and of all the conspirators, male and female—on the night of 2nd April 1889 the General disappeared. He had fled, some said in disguise, to Brussels, accompanied by only one friend, a lady. Instead of his presence, his friends got—a telephonic manifesto. It was the end. M. Constans had won; the Republic was saved.

Presently the Senate was constituted into a High Court of Justice for the trial of General Boulanger, M. Rochefort, and others—of course in their absence—for high crimes and misdemeanours. The Procureur-Général, M. Quesnay de Beaurepaire, presented a tremendous indictment, charging embezzlement, conspiracy, breaches of discipline, and many other crimes; and in due time the sentence was pronounced—imprisonment for life in a fortress. It was, in a sense, a *brutum fulmen*, for

the General was safe in London, Jersey, or Brussels, among which harbours of refuge he passed his time and spent the relics of his friends' subscriptions. But the whole affair of the trial, the crushing demonstration of the prosecutor, and the wretchedly lame replies that were offered by the General's friends, had their effect, and the general election in the autumn of the year gave an overwhelming majority to the Republicans over the Boulangists and Reactionaries combined.

It only remained for the inevitable "revelations" to come from within the camp of the conspirators; and this want was supplied last year, when a young Boulangist Deputy, M. Mermeix, published in the *Figaro* a series of articles called "Les Coulisses du Boulangisme." It was a miserable raising of the veil; and none of the revelations were seriously disputed. It involved the Bonapartists and the Royalists as deeply as the extreme Radicals; it showed the cynicism of Prince Napoleon in an only less unpleasant light than it showed the unscrupulousness of the Comte de Paris. The latter lost his money—two or three millions of francs—but he lost much more besides. Perhaps, in the long run, that will be the most serious result of Boulangism—the final disappearance of the present generation of Orleanists from the list of possible claimants of supreme power in France. It is less certain that the Paris elector will profit by the lesson that he has received. But the abolition, for good and all, of *scrutin de liste*, and the breaking up of France into constituencies of manageable size, have infinitely lessened the chances of any would-be dictator who hopes to succeed by means of the ballot-box. Boulanger has killed himself; but before he died he killed the Orleanists and he killed the *plébiscite*.

W. H. SMITH

1825–1891

Obituary Notice, Wednesday, October 7, 1891

William Henry Smith was born in London on 24th June 1825. At the time of his death, therefore, he had entered upon his 67th year. His father, who bore the same name, was the founder of the great firm in the Strand for the distribution and sale of newspapers and other periodicals, which, starting from very modest beginnings, grew to enormous proportions under the son, and, among other things, attained almost a monopoly of the railway bookstall business. Mr. Smith, who was educated at the Tavistock Grammar School, became a partner in his father's firm while still a young man, and contributed largely by his energy and sagacity to its rapid and lucrative development. It was not till he had reached the age of forty that he had time to turn his attention to political life. He was naturally attracted by the representation of Westminster, in which his business was centred, but, at the time, the adventure seemed to be a daring one, nor was it crowned in the first instance with success. The political traditions of Westminster had been bound up, even before the Reform Act of 1832, with those of Liberalism, or rather of Radicalism ; and though politics had changed their aspect in many ways since the days of Fox, and since those of Burdett, there had only been a single real break, in 1841, in the succession of Liberal representatives down to the general election of 1865, when Mr. W. H. Smith came into the field as a Conservative candidate.

Lord Palmerston's long reign was drawing to a close, and his eventual successor was seen to be Mr. Gladstone, who had been

more and more inclining to "the Left," and had already more than half won the hearts of the Radicals. Nevertheless, the Whigs were still unshaken in their loyalty to their old party, though it had gone far beyond the landmarks contemplated by the authors of the Act of 1832. Mr. W. H. Smith had to confront a coalition too formidable to be broken through at the first onset by a man previously unknown in public life. His opponents were both personages of eminence and influence—the one a member of the Grosvenor family, the lords of the soil in Westminster, and the other Mr. John Stuart Mill, at that time, perhaps, the most powerful intellectual force in the country. Whigs and Radicals united to return Mr. Grosvenor and Mr. Mill at the top of the poll with nearly equal votes, but, though Mr. W. H. Smith was left in a minority of some 700, it was justly regarded as significant that, with all his disadvantages, he received the support of 3824 electors. That was before the extension of the franchise and the introduction of secret voting, which, however they have operated elsewhere, have acted in Westminster, and generally throughout London, in a Conservative direction. It was, of course, a settled thing that Mr. Smith was to stand again, and he would probably have won even had the situation remained otherwise unaltered.

But between 1865 and 1868 many things had happened. The borough franchise had been established on the basis of simple rating; Mr. Gladstone, on whose Reform Bill the Duke of Westminster's son and heir had led the attack, had revealed himself as the ally of the advanced Radicals of those days, and had begun his campaign against the Irish Church Establishment; and Mr. John Stuart Mill, though he had delivered some thoughtful and interesting speeches in the House of Commons, had not been a Parliamentary success, and had alienated much support by his extreme and unpractical views on various subjects. In 1868, accordingly, when Mr. W. H. Smith again challenged the seat for Westminster against Mr. Grosvenor and Mr. Mill, he came in at the head of the poll with 7648 votes, while Mr. Grosvenor, who obtained the second seat, had more than 1000 votes less, and Mr. Mill was a rather bad third. It seemed probable that if another Conservative had stood with Mr. Smith, both would have been elected, as, in fact, was the case in 1874 and in 1880. This was generally regarded as a remarkable party victory, taking into consideration the Liberal

traditions of Westminster. It at once secured for Mr. Smith a prominent position in the Conservative ranks, which was not the less influential because he represented a type of Conservatism quite different from the old-world Toryism once in vogue with the aristocracy and one better suited to the enlarged borough constituencies.

It is difficult, indeed, to conceive of Mr. Smith as at any time an ardent champion of privilege, or much governed by a sentimental passion for the past. There is a story told, which we believe to be well founded, that Mr. Smith, when he first began to turn his thoughts towards a Parliamentary career, some time during the Palmerstonian era, was disposed to take the Whig rather than the Tory side, as was then usual with rising persons in the middle class to which he essentially belonged, and of which he was never ashamed. It is said that he was put up for ballot at the Reform Club, but that a taint of Whiggish exclusiveness which lingered in that establishment prevented his election. As Whiggism, however, was rapidly passing into Radicalism, it is doubtful whether Mr. Smith would in any case have long withheld his support from the Conservative party, which he came to look upon as best calculated to safeguard the interests of the middle class, the free development of commerce and industry, and the legitimate rights of property and capital.

Mr. W. H. Smith was at no time fond of obtruding himself upon the attention of the House of Commons, even when, in after years, he became its leader. But during the Parliament which lasted from 1869 to 1874 he had opportunities enough of showing his intelligence, his industry, his business capacity, and, what above all distinguished him, his high sense of public duty. Mr. Disraeli, so different in every element of his character, had, nevertheless, the piercing and watchful eye of genius, and picked out Mr. Smith as one of the recruits with whom he intended, if recalled to office, to strengthen the Conservative phalanx where it seemed to be weakest. It was necessary to give adequate representation in the Administration formed after Mr. Gladstone's overthrow in 1874 to business interests and to the borough members. Mr. Smith had fortified his claims, not only by his Parliamentary service, but by his work as a member of the first London School Board, and his ascendency in Westminster had become indisputable, for in 1874

he was returned by 9371 votes, with Sir Charles Russell as his Conservative colleague, against 3749 votes recorded for the highest Liberal candidate.

It was not, therefore, at all surprising that, when Mr. Disraeli found himself at the head of a majority and formed a new Government, he reserved a place in it for Mr. Smith, who became Financial Secretary to the Treasury, an office filled by many men who have risen to the highest offices in the State. As Secretary to the Treasury Mr. Smith made his mark in his own quiet and capable way, and the murmurs with which his appointment had been received in some quarters, where pretentious and obtrusive self-assertion is alone understood, were soon silenced. No serious criticism was provoked when, on the death of Mr. Ward Hunt in 1877, Mr. Smith was promoted to the laborious and most responsible office of First Lord of the Admiralty. At the head of one of "the great spending departments" Mr. Smith's business experience, his financial knowledge, and his power of organisation were usefully applied. It cannot, indeed, be said of him, any more than of any other First Lord in our time, that he was able to place the Navy on a footing wholly commensurate with the requirements of our Empire, but it may be acknowledged that he left it stronger than he found it. During the stormy times that followed the Russian crisis and the Bulgarian atrocity agitation, Mr. Smith confined himself mainly to his official duties. At the general election of 1880, which swept his party out of power, he and his colleagues held their own well in Westminster, though assailed by two strong radical candidates, Mr. John Morley and the present Lord Hobhouse.

Returning to Opposition, Mr. Smith, during the Parliament which lasted from 1880 to 1885, was known as a rare, but always respectfully heard, speaker, chiefly on financial, naval, and business questions. Before this period his moderation and sagacity had drawn forth favourable comment even from his opponents, and about the time when he became First Lord of the Admiralty, an influential weekly review, then strongly opposed to the foreign policy of the Government, indulged in some interesting speculations on "a Smith Administration," without any suspicion, of course, that in the changes and chances of politics it would be found itself supporting a Ministry that might be to some extent entitled to this name against Mr.

Gladstone. Among Mr. Smith's parliamentary appearances at this time may be mentioned his severe criticisms in 1884 on the condition of the Navy, which he considered to be inadequate to the increasing demands upon it. He followed up these criticisms by a letter subsequently published in our columns, and their substantial justice may be held to be proved by the sudden expenditure that had to be incurred in the following year during the crisis of the Penjdeh dispute and by the financial confusion discovered at the Admiralty, about the time of the change of Government.

Mr. Smith also interested himself keenly in Irish affairs, directing special attention to the question of land purchase, and visiting Ireland in order to study it on the spot. When Mr. Gladstone resigned in 1885, after the defeat of Mr. Childers's Budget, and with a view to an electoral campaign among the new constituencies, Lord Salisbury had to form a Cabinet under all the disadvantages of being in a minority in the House of Commons. He chose Mr. Smith as the Secretary for War, where the experience he had gained in the other great spending department was likely to be useful in dealing with a still more troublesome task. It is a temptation to speculate about what Mr. Smith might really have done for the reorganisation of the War Office and the improvement of the Army if he had had time to put the business through. In point of fact he only held the office for a few months in the autumn and winter of 1885, and again in 1886 for about the same period, during which the vacation hampers both Ministers and the permanent departmental staff. At the close of 1885, when the general election had left the parliamentary position undecided, and Mr. Gladstone had not yet openly declared for the policy of buying up the Irish vote, Lord Carnarvon resigned the Viceroyalty of Ireland and his seat in the Cabinet. This involved the resignation also of the Chief Secretary, Sir William Hart Dyke.

In the anxieties of the Irish situation, with Home Rule in the air, and organised crime to be grappled with, it was necessary that the Chief Secretary should be a Cabinet Minister. Mr. Smith, with characteristic abnegation of self and devotion to duty, undertook the work, exchanging a Secretaryship of State for a nominally inferior office. It was hoped that his interest in the land purchase question would meet with some

response in Ireland. But time was denied him. He went over to Dublin and was sworn in a member of the Irish Privy Council. He held the Chief Secretaryship, however, for less than a week, since the Government was overthrown during the debate on the Address upon the question of "three acres and a cow," and Mr. Gladstone came into office to try his hand at Home Rule. When the defeat of the Home Rule Bill necessitated another appeal to the constituencies, Mr. Smith, who had been elected in 1885 for the Strand Division—a portion of the old city of Westminster—by a majority of 3159, was again chosen by a majority of 4526. His re-election on accepting office has never been challenged, and recently, when his appointment as Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports was discovered, somewhat unexpectedly, to involve the vacating of his seat, the Radical candidate publicly announced that he would not think of committing himself to an act so ungracious as that of putting Mr. Smith to any inconvenience on such an occasion.

On the formation of Lord Salisbury's Second Administration in the summer of 1886, Mr. Smith returned to his former place at the War Office, but he was again withdrawn from it after a few months' tenure in the course of the Ministerial changes which were brought about by Lord Randolph Churchill's resignation. While Mr. Goschen succeeded Lord Randolph Churchill as Chancellor of the Exchequer, the leadership of the House of Commons was assigned to Mr. Smith, who took with it the office of First Lord of the Treasury, which, as in 1885, when it was held by Lord Iddesleigh, was separated from the Premiership. Mr. Smith's promotion was at first viewed with doubt, and even with hostility, by a section of the Conservative party; but in the five Parliamentary Sessions that have since elapsed, he completely conquered the confidence of the House of Commons. Making no pretence to eloquence, but speaking on all occasions with a simple plainness that had a dignity of its own, Mr. Smith showed always so much honesty of purpose, so entire an absence of bitter partisanship, such temperance of language, and such suavity of manner, that perhaps no leader of the House since the days of Lord Althorp has enjoyed a larger measure of universal respect. Hardly the rudest of the Irish Separatists or the most provocative of self-asserting Radicals could venture to be insolent to a man by whom the House of Commons was well content to be represented.

Yet Mr. Smith's task, it is needless to say, has been no light one. He led the House during an anxious period of storm and stress, through the heated debates on the Crimes Act and the Special Commission, and the prolonged discussions on such complicated measures as the Local Government Bill, and the Land Purchase Bill, and on the reformed rules of the House. Nor was Mr. Smith found wanting when he had to deal with subjects of a different kind, like the Royal grants, and to give expression officially to the sympathies of the House of Commons on occasions of public sorrow or rejoicing. He could not, indeed, command the sonorous oratory and elevated diction of Mr. Gladstone, but he could speak, on behalf of Englishmen, the language of a plain Englishman both forcibly and to the purpose.

It was, however, the moral side of Mr. Smith's character that impressed and won over his colleagues, his unaffected kindliness and his strong sense of duty. A sense of something almost approaching to dismay was produced among his Parliamentary colleagues, and not those of his own party only, when it became known in the course of last session that his health had been seriously shaken, and that he had found it difficult to throw off the effects of an attack of the influenza epidemic. It is to be feared that his devotion to his work helped to break down a constitution not of the strongest. Mr. Smith, however, was unwilling to disorganise the Government by creating a vacancy in the leadership of the House so long as it was at all possible for him to discharge his Parliamentary duties. His colleagues, it need scarcely be added, shrank from the thought of losing him. But he was not able to appear in his place in Parliament during the latter part of last Session, and the question how his place could be filled if he were unable to return to his duties after the prorogation had begun to occupy the minds of Unionist politicians.

Mr. Smith's services, it is pleasant to remember, had already received public recognition. In 1889, when he had given ample proof of his high quality as leader of the House, and when some ill-natured *frondeurs* in his party had not yet been finally put to silence, the Ministerialists in the House of Commons united to present him with an address expressing their gratitude, and, on the completion of the twenty-first year of his Parliamentary life, he was entertained at a banquet in St.

James's Hall by his old constituents. Earlier in the same year he was the guest of the leading merchants, bankers, and men of business of the City of London at Merchant Taylors' Hall. A stanch and liberal supporter of the Church of England, Mr. Smith enjoyed the full confidence and respect of Churchmen, who will sincerely mourn his loss. On the death of Lord Granville, the Queen appointed Mr. Smith, as has been said, Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, which gave him the right to occupy Walmer Castle, where, like his illustrious predecessor, the Duke of Wellington, he closed his life. As Mr. Smith was exceedingly fond of yachting—indeed it was at one time hoped that a cruise he was lately able to take in his yacht would restore him, comparatively speaking, to health—Walmer Castle had especial attractions for him. It is somewhat curious that though Mr. Smith was, of course, a very wealthy man, he had not, until he took up his residence at Walmer, any country house, except his fine villa on the Thames, near Henley, which any other prosperous man of business might have owned. It is understood that he had purchased large quantities of land, particularly in Devonshire, but he had not yet grouped his estates around a home. His life, after it ceased to be absorbed in business, was given up to public duties.

Mr. Smith, who married, in 1858, Emily, the eldest daughter of the late Mr. F. D. Danvers, leaves a son, Mr. W. F. D. Smith, whose coming of age was celebrated last year by a banquet at which nearly 300 persons employed by the well-known firm in the Strand assembled, and several daughters, most of whom are married. In addition to his political appointments, Mr. Smith was a member of the Council of King's College, London, and received the honorary degree of D.C.L. from the University of Oxford in 1879.

CHARLES STEWART PARNELL

1846–1891

Obituary Notice, Thursday, October 8, 1891

Charles Stewart Parnell, the eldest son of the late John Henry Parnell, high sheriff of Wicklow in 1836, was born at Avondale, in that county, in June 1846. His mother was Delia Tudor, daughter of Admiral Charles Stewart, of the American Navy, who, as commodore, had been conspicuous in the naval struggle with England early in the century, when the United States struggled stoutly for the palm of naval supremacy. Mr. Parnell's family had long been settled in Cheshire, and from their seat there his great-uncle, Sir Henry Parnell, whose motion on the Civil List turned out the Wellington Government in 1830, and who was afterwards Secretary for War and Paymaster of the Forces under the Whigs, took his title of Lord Congleton.

The Parnells belonged to the "Englishry" of Ireland; one of them, Dr. Thomas Parnell, an author now best known by his poem "The Hermit," friend of Pope and Swift, and the subject of a sympathetic biography by Goldsmith, used to bewail his clerical exile among the Irish, and indeed consistently neglected his duties as Archdeacon of Clogher; others, later on, during the period of Protestant ascendency, were judges, officials, and members of Parliament; Sir John Parnell, who joined with Grattan and other patriots of that day in fighting for an independence that secured a monopoly of power to their own creed and caste, was Chancellor of the Exchequer just before the Union. Sir John Parnell's grandson was Mr. John Henry Parnell, of Avondale, the father of the future chief of the

Separatists, who thus inherited on the paternal side an antipathy to the Union, and on the maternal side the traditions of a bitter conflict with England. Mr. Parnell nevertheless received, like many scions of the Irish landlord class, an exclusively English education at various private schools, and afterwards at Magdalen College, Cambridge, where, however, he did not take a degree, and where, it is said, he was "sent down" for some rather gross breach of academic discipline.

Some surprise was expressed in Ireland when, in 1874, Mr. Parnell, then high sheriff of Wicklow, came forward to oppose in the county Dublin the re-election of Colonel Taylor, who had taken office as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in the Disraeli Government. He stood as an advocate of Home Rule, to which many of the Irish loyalists had temporarily attached themselves in their disgust at the success of Mr. Gladstone's disestablishment policy. But Mr. Parnell's "Nationalism" proved to be of another type. If it had a sentimental origin in his family traditions, it was qualified and dominated by the cold temper and the taste for political strategy which he seems to have inherited from his American kinsfolk. Defeated by a large majority in Dublin county, he was more successful a little more than a year later when a vacancy was created in the representation of Meath by the death of John Martin, one of the "Young Ireland" party and a convict of 1848, like his brother-in-law, John Mitchel.

When Mr. Parnell entered the House of Commons in April 1875 the Liberal Opposition was disorganised, the Conservative Government was both positively and negatively strong, and the Home Rule party, under Mr. Butt's leadership, was of little account. Mr. Parnell immediately allied himself with Mr. Biggar, who had struck out a line of his own by defying decency and the rules of Parliament, and, with more or less regular aid from Mr. F. H. O'Donnell and Mr. O'Connor Power, they soon made themselves a political force. How far Mr. Parnell saw ahead of him at this time, what his motives were, and what secret influences were acting upon him, may perhaps never be revealed. He found, as he believed, a method of bringing an intolerable pressure to bear upon the Imperial Parliament and the Government of the day by creating incessant disturbances and delaying all business, and he persisted in this course, in spite of the protests and the denunciations of Mr. Butt

and the more respectable among the Irish Nationalists. To quote the triumphant language of one of his own followers, writing, almost officially, long afterwards, whereas obstructive tactics had been previously directed against particular Bills, "the obstruction which now faced Parliament intervened in every single detail of its business, and not merely in contentious business, but in business that up to this time had been considered formal." The design was boastfully avowed that, unless the Imperial Legislature agreed to grant the Irish demands as formulated by Mr. Biggar and Mr. Parnell, its power would be paralysed, its time wasted, its honour and dignity dragged through the dirt.

In 1877 the whole scheme of obstructive policy was disclosed and exemplified in the debates on the Prisons Bill, the Army Bill, and the South Africa Bill. Speaking on the last measure, Mr. Parnell said that, "as an Irishman" and one detesting "English cruelty and tyranny," he felt "a special satisfaction in preventing and thwarting the intentions of the Government." On one occasion the House was kept sitting for twenty-six hours by the small band of obstructionists. The rules of the House, even when cautiously strengthened at the instance of Sir Stafford Northcote, proved entirely inadequate to control men, like Mr. Parnell, undeterred by any scruples and master of all the technicalities of Parliamentary practice. Motions of suspension produced as little effect as public censure, nor was Mr. Butt, though he strongly condemned the policy of exasperation and lamented the degradation of Irish politics into a "vulgar brawl," able to stem the tide. He was deposed in the winter of 1877 by the Home Rule Confederation of Great Britain, a body including most of the "advanced" wing of the Irish in England and Scotland; and though a *modus vivendi* was adopted in the Parliamentary party itself, and accepted by Mr. Parnell, as he said, in Mr. Butt's presence, on the ground that he "was a young man and could wait," it was felt that power had passed away from the moderates, of whom many were afraid to oppose the obstructives with a general election in sight, hoping, as the Parnellites said, to tide over the crisis, and "survive till the advent of the blessed hour when the return of the Liberals to power would give them the long-desired chance of throwing off the temporary mask of national views to assume the permanent livery of English officials." History sometimes

repeats itself with curious irony, and these words are almost textually the same as those lately used by Mr. Parnell of those most intimately associated with him in his campaign against Mr. Butt.

The session of 1878 emphasised the cleavage; Mr. Butt practically resigned the lead to the extreme faction, and both spoke and voted in favour of the foreign policy of the Government. Mr. Parnell pursued his course of calculated Parliamentary violence. In 1879 Mr. Butt died, a broken man, and Mr. Shaw was chosen to fill his place as "Sessional Chairman" of the party. But events were playing to Mr. Parnell's hands. He had been associated with some of the Radical leaders in the attack on flogging in the Army, and he had been chosen as the first president of the Land League, which was started at Irishtown, in Mayo, a couple of weeks before Mr. Butt's death, and which embodied the ideas brought back from the United States by Mr. Davitt after his provisional release from penal servitude, with three other Fenian prisoners, at the end of 1877. Mr. Parnell was at the head of the "Reception Committee" which presented an address to these patriots, and the list of those associated with him contains, besides the names of Mr. John Dillon and Mr. Patrick Egan, those of James Carey, Daniel Curley, and J. Brady.

Up to this point there was nothing known to the public to show that Mr. Parnell was not pursuing a Parliamentary agitation by irregular and censurable methods. How far he had previously allied himself with those who had other objects in view, and who worked by other methods, remains obscure. At any rate he quickly entered into the policy that Mr. Davitt had devised in America in co-operation with Devoy and others, and after taking counsel with the leaders of the Clan-na-Gael and of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. That policy had been originally sketched by Fintan Lalor, one of the '48 men, and was intended to work upon the land-hunger of the Irish peasantry in order to get rid of the British connection. Davitt and Devoy brought over the revolutionary party to their views, including extremists like Ford of the *Irish World*, an open advocate of physical force, whether in the form of armed rebellion or of terrorist outrage. Proposals for co-operation with the Parnellites on the basis of dropping the pretence of federation and putting in its stead "a formal declaration in

favour of self-government," of giving the foremost place to the land agitation, and adopting an aggressive Parliamentary policy generally, were transmitted to Ireland, and, though not formally accepted either by Mr. Parnell for the moment or by the Irish Fenians, became, in the opinion of the Special Commissioners, "the basis on which the American-Irish Nationalists afterwards lent their support to Mr. Parnell and his policy."

This "new departure," which Mr. Davitt advocated as widening the field of revolutionary effort, involved Mr. Parnell's adoption of a more decided line on the land question and the opening up of closer relations with his allies beyond the Atlantic. In June 1879, therefore, a few weeks after the establishment of the Land League, and in the teeth of the denunciations of Archbishop MacHale, Mr. Parnell, accompanied by Mr. Davitt, addressed a League meeting at Westport, told the tenantry that they could not pay their rents in presence of the agricultural crisis, but that they should let the landlords know they intended in any case to "hold a firm grip on their homesteads and lands." He added that no concession obtained in Parliament would buy off his resolution to secure all, including, as Mr. Davitt took care to say, the unqualified claim for national independence.

Mr. Parnell's advances to the Revolutionists in America had an immediate reward, not only in the removal of any remaining obstacles in the path of his ambition, but in the supply of the sinews of war for the work of agitation and electioneering. Mr. Davitt started the Land League with money obtained out of the Skirmishing Fund, established by O'Donovan Rossa in order to strike England "anywhere she could be hurt," and then in the hands of the Clan-na-Gael chiefs. But much more was needed, and in October 1879 Mr. Parnell started with Mr. Dillon for the United States. During the voyage he imparted his views to the correspondent of a New York paper, afterwards a witness before the Special Commission, and told him, among other things, that his idea of a true revolutionary movement in Ireland was that it should partake both of a constitutional and an illegal character, "using the Constitution for its own purposes, but also taking advantage of the secret combinations." He was cordially welcomed by most of the extreme faction, and gratified them with declarations quite to their own mind. He told them that the land question must be acted upon in "some

extraordinary and unusual way" to secure any good result, and that "the great cause could not be won without shedding a drop of blood." He went even beyond this point in the famous speech at Cincinnati, which he subsequently attempted to deny, but which was reported in the *Irish World*, and was held to be proved by Sir James Hannen and his colleagues. He then said that the "ultimate goal" at which Irishmen aimed was "to destroy the last link which kept Ireland bound to England." The American wing were perfectly satisfied, and Mr. Parnell, when he was summoned back to Ireland by the news of the dissolution, felt that he could rely on their support, pecuniary and other.

It was not at first so easy to convince the Irish Fenians—who had distrusted and abjured any form of Parliamentary action—that they ought to vote for Parnellite candidates; and one or two Parnellite meetings were disturbed by this element. But Mr. Parnell's speeches during the electoral campaign of 1880 showed them how far he was prepared to go in their direction, and how little inclined he was, to use his own phrase, "to fix the boundary to the march of a nation." It was at this time that Mr. Parnell told, with great applause, the story, which became very popular on Land League platforms, of the American sympathiser who offered him "five dollars for bread and twenty dollars for lead." The leading spokesmen and organisers of the League—Sheridan, Brennan, Boyton, and Redpath—were either known Fenians or used language going beyond that of Fenianism; and the same thing may be said of Mr. Biggar, Mr. O'Kelly, and Mr. Matt Harris, members of Mr. Parnell's Parliamentary following. The policy which Mr. Davitt, acting as the envoy of the Irish extremists, thus used Mr. Parnell to carry through, was developed in the announcement of the boycotting system in the autumn of 1880.

Meanwhile, the alliance had already borne fruit at the general election of that year, when Mr. Parnell, aided somewhat irregularly by Mr. Egan out of the exchequer of the League, was returned for three constituencies—Meath, Mayo, and the city of Cork. He decided to sit for the last, and as "the member for Cork" he has since been known. The overthrow of the Beaconsfield Government, which had appealed to the country to strengthen the Empire against Irish disorder and disloyalty, was an encouragement to the Parnellites, who had a

narrow and shifting majority in the ranks of the Parliamentary party. Mr. Shaw was supplanted as chairman by Mr. Parnell, and an open separation between the two sections ensued. The Parnellites took their seats on the Opposition benches; the Moderate Home Rulers sat on the Ministerial side below the gangway. To the latter Mr. Gladstone seemed to incline most favourably, as he showed afterwards when he proposed to make Mr. Shaw one of the Chief Commissioners under the Land Act. The Liberals, though they took the opportunity of dropping the Peace Preservation Act, were not disposed to reopen the land question, and it was only under pressure that Mr. Forster hastily introduced the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, which was rejected in the House of Lords, and appointed the Bessborough Commission.

Mr. Parnell and his party seized the opportunities afforded by the distress in Ireland and the Parliamentary situation to push on the operations of the League. The policy of boycotting had been expounded and enforced early in the year in Mr. Parnell's speech at Ennis, a few days after Lord Mountmorres's murder, when he urged the peasantry, if any man among them took an evicted farm, to put the offender "into a moral Coventry, by isolating him from the rest of his kind as if he were a leper of old." This doctrine was rapidly propagated by Mr. Dillon, Mr. Biggar, and the organisers of the League, and in the autumn the persecution of Captain Boycott and many other persons became a public scandal. This system of acting upon those whom Mr. Parnell had described as "weak and cowardly," because they did not heartily join in the refusal to pay rent, has been pronounced on the highest judicial authority to amount to a criminal and illegal conspiracy, devised and carried out to lower the rental and selling price of land and to crush the landlords. Mr. Parnell declared that he never incited to crime, but though he and his colleagues knew that boycotting and the unwritten law of the League led to outrages, wherever the organisation spread, they took no effective measures to denounce and repress crime, and it is now plain that they could not do so without alienating the American support on which they were dependent.

The ordinary law was shown to be powerless by the failure of the prosecution of Mr. Parnell and others for conspiracy in Dublin in the opening days of 1881, when the jury disagreed, and

Mr. Parnell, in announcing the result to his American friends, telegraphed his thanks to the *Irish World* for "constant co-operation and successful support in our great cause." But the progress of unpunished crime, in which the American-Irish brutally exulted, and the paralysis of the law, compelled Mr. Gladstone's Government to act. Early in the Session of 1881 Mr. Forster introduced his "Protection of Persons and Property Bill" and his "Arms Bill," of which the former empowered the Executive to arrest and detain without trial persons reasonably suspected of crime. At the mere rumour of this Egan transferred the finances of the League to Paris. It was a part of Mr. Parnell's task, as he well knew, to fight the "coercion" measures tooth and nail, but, though he led the attack, the most critical conflicts were precipitated by the passion and imprudence of less cold-blooded politicians. We need not here recapitulate the history of that struggle, in which obstruction reached a height previously unknown, and in which the knot had to be cut for the moment by the enforcement of the inherent powers of the Chair. The Parnellite members were again and again suspended, and at length, after several weeks, both Bills were carried.

Mr. Parnell's party had by this time assumed an attitude towards the Government of Mr. Gladstone which was highly pleasing to the *Irish World* and the Nationalist organs in Ireland, but was ominous for the prospects of the Land Bill. They did not, however, venture to offer a direct and determined opposition to a measure securing great pecuniary advantages to the Irish tenants. They could not go beyond abstaining on the question of principle, and denouncing the whole scheme as inadequate. Of course, if the Land Act had succeeded in accordance with Mr. Gladstone's sanguine hopes, it would have cut the ground from under Mr. Parnell's feet, and deprived him of the basis of agitation on which his alliance with the Irish Extremists rested, and from which his party derived their pecuniary supplies. No sooner, therefore, had the Land Act become law than the word went forth from the offices of the League that the tenants were not to be allowed to avail themselves of it freely, but that only some "test cases" were to be put forward. The penalties of any infraction of this addition to the unwritten law were well understood, for all this while terrorism and outrage were rampant. Mr. Gladstone was more indignant at the rejection

of his message of peace than at the proofs, which had been long forthcoming, of the excesses of Irish lawlessness. He denounced Mr. Parnell at Leeds, in impassioned language, and declared that "the resources of civilisation against its enemies were not yet exhausted." Mr. Parnell replied defiantly that Mr. Gladstone had before "eaten all his own words," and predicted that these "brave words of this English Minister would be scattered as chaff" by the determination of the Irish to regain "their lost legislative independence." A few days later he was arrested and imprisoned in Kilmainham, with Mr. Sexton, Mr. O'Brien, the editor of his organ, *United Ireland*, and several others. Egan, on the suggestion of Ford, at once issued a "No-Rent" manifesto; the books of the Land League were spirited out of the jurisdiction of the Irish Executive, and as a natural consequence the Land League was suppressed.

But the struggle was carried on, with little substantial change, during Mr. Parnell's imprisonment. The Ladies' League nominally took the work in hand; American money was not wanting; boycotting was rigidly enforced, and was followed, as Mr. Gladstone had shown, by crime. For this state of things the incendiary journalism, subsidised and imported by the Parnellites, was, and long after remained, responsible. The *Irish World*, with its advocacy of dynamite and dagger, was used to "spread the light" among the masses, and *United Ireland* was scarcely behindhand. The *Freeman's Journal*, which had opposed Mr. Parnell's extreme views on the Land Act, was compelled to come to heel, and the priesthood, who never loved him, as a Protestant and as a suspected ally of the Fenians, found their influence waning in presence of the despotism of the League.

The secret history of all that went on during Mr. Parnell's imprisonment in Kilmainham is not yet revealed, though some light has been thrown upon it by the recent split among the Nationalists. Mr. Parnell, for instance, said the other day in the last speech he delivered that "the white flag had been first hung out from Kilmainham" by Mr. William O'Brien. Be that as it may, it is evident that in the spring of 1882 both the Government and the Parnellites were anxious to compromise their quarrel. Mr. Gladstone was pressed by the Radicals to get rid of coercion, and the patriots were eager to be again enjoying liberty and power. Negotiations were opened through

Mr. O'Shea ; Mr. Parnell was willing to promise that Ireland should be tranquillised—for the moment and in appearance—through the agency of the League ; Mr. Forster, refusing to become a party to this sort of bargain with those who had organised a system of lawless terrorism, resigned ; Lord Spencer and Lord Frederick Cavendish went to Ireland as envoys of a policy of concession, including a Bill for wiping out arrears of rent.

How long Mr. Parnell would have continued to give a *quid pro quo* for this can only be guessed at. A few days after the ratification of what became known as the Kilmainham Treaty, Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke were murdered in the Phœnix Park by persons then unknown. Mr. Parnell expressed his horror of the crime in the House of Commons, but refused to admit that it was a reason for the Coercion Bill immediately introduced by Sir William Harcourt. This change of policy was forced upon Mr. Gladstone by the imperious demands of public opinion, which was exasperated by the defiant attitude of the Irish party. The forces of obstruction, however, were for the moment broken by the shock. The Coercion Act became law, and was at the outset vigorously administered by Lord Spencer and Mr. Trevelyan, who were, in consequence, attacked with the most infamous calumnies by *United Ireland* and other Parnellite organs. The authors of several wicked crimes were brought to justice in Ireland in spite of the clamour of the Parnellites against judges and jurymen, and early in 1883 the Invincible conspiracy, which had compassed the deaths of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke, was exposed by the evidence of the informer, James Carey. Mr. Forster made this the occasion of a powerful attack on Mr. Parnell in the House of Commons, telling the story of the Kilmainham negotiations in the light of later disclosures, and pointing out that the language used without rebuke in Mr. Parnell's organs and by his followers plainly sowed the seed of crime. Mr. Parnell's callous defiance of the voice of public opinion shocked even those inclined to make allowance for him. Radical sympathy was withdrawn from him, while there was about this time also a widening breach with the Irish-Americans, who did not wish to have outrage even condemned by implication, and who were entering upon the dynamite campaign.

Nevertheless, Mr. Parnell's hold on his own party was

unshaken ; from time to time there were movements of revolt ; he had to speak scornfully once of "Papist rats." Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. O'Connor Power, Mr. F. H. O'Donnell, and Mr. Healy at different times tried to thwart him, but he swept all opposition away, and reduced his critics to subjection or drove them out of public life. The Land League was allowed to revive under the name of the National League, and, operating more cautiously on the old lines, secured Mr. Parnell's power. It was evident that the extension of the franchise would give Mr. Parnell the power of nominating the representatives of three-fourths of Ireland. The priesthood, trembling for their influence, came round to him. But he was unable to induce the Government either to repeal the Coercion Act or to tamper with the land question. It was when the Franchise Bill was introduced that Mr. Parnell's influence over the Government was first manifested. He insisted that Ireland should be included in the Bill and that the number of the Irish representatives should not be diminished, and on both points he prevailed. Meanwhile the alliance with the American-Irish had been renewed. The Clan-na-Gael captured the Land League in the United States, and in view of the elections in Great Britain funds were provided, Egan being now a member of the organisation.

Simultaneously a more active policy was adopted at home. As soon as the passage of the Franchise Bill had been made sure the Parnellites joined with the Conservatives to defeat Mr. Gladstone. Towards the weak Salisbury Administration that followed Mr. Parnell showed, during the electoral period, a benevolent neutrality, acting on the principle he had laid down several years before in Cork—"Don't be afraid to let in the Tory, but put out the Whig." He judged that he would be thus more likely to hold the balance of power in the new Parliament, and Mr. Gladstone held the same opinion when he asked for a Liberal majority strong enough to vote down Conservatives and Parnellites together. In an address to the Irish electors on the eve of the struggle the Parnellites fiercely denounced the Liberal party and its leader. Mr. Parnell had even amused Lord Carnarvon at a critical time with a deceptive negotiation.

The issue of the contest left Mr. Gladstone's forces just balanced by those of the Conservatives and Parnellites combined. He at once resolved to secure the latter by an offer of Home

Rule, though he had up to that time professed his devotion to the Union, and though nine-tenths of his followers had pledged themselves to it. His overtures were of course welcomed, though without a too trustful effusiveness, by Mr. Parnell; the Conservative Government was overthrown on a side issue; Mr. Gladstone came into power and introduced his Home Rule Bill. Much was made of Mr. Parnell's unqualified acceptance of that measure. It now appears that he objected to several points in it, being no doubt aware of the view taken of it by his American allies, but he did not press his objections, fearing, as he said since, that the insistence on further concessions would deprive Mr. Gladstone of other colleagues and break up the Government. Mr. Parnell's temporary forbearance, which had no element of finality in it, did not save the Bill. In the Parliament of 1886 his numerical forces were nearly the same as those he previously commanded, but he was now allied with a greatly enfeebled Gladstonian Opposition.

It was necessary to affect the most scrupulous constitutionalism, and for a time Mr. Parnell played the part well. The Irish-Americans took the cue from him, and were willing to wait. Dynamite outrages had ceased. But the necessities of the case urged him to insist on reopening the Irish land question, and in Ireland the National League continued to work on the old system. Boycotting and its attendant incidents increased, and, during Mr. Parnell's temporary withdrawal from active politics, Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Brien committed the party to the Plan of Campaign, which involved a pitched battle with the Executive and the law. The introduction of the Crimes Bill was the direct result of this policy, which Mr. Parnell privately condemned. His opposition to the Bill was of the familiar kind. But the tactics of obstruction which were then pursued were overshadowed in the public eye by the controversy on "Parnellism and Crime" that arose in our own columns. Seeing that the alliance between Mr. Parnell and the Gladstonian Opposition was growing closer and closer, that it was employed to obstruct the Executive Government and to set at naught the law, and that the success of Home Rule would deliver over Ireland to a faction tainted by association with Ford and Sheridan, we thought it right to call public attention to some salient episodes in Mr. Parnell's career and to draw certain inferences from them. We also conceived it to be our

duty to publish some documentary evidence that came into our hands, of the authenticity of which we were honestly convinced, and which seemed to us perfectly consistent with what was proved and notorious.

Mr. Parnell gave a comprehensive denial to all our charges and inferences, including the alleged letter apologising to some extremist ally for denouncing the Phœnix Park murders in the House of Commons. He did not, however, accept our challenge or bring an action against the *Times*, nor was it till more than a year later, after Mr. O'Donnell had raised the question by some futile proceedings, that he demanded a Parliamentary inquiry into the statements made on our behalf by the Attorney-General. We need not here recite the story of the appointment of the Special Commission and its result. The evidence of Richard Pigott broke down, and with it the letters on which we had in part relied, and Mr. Parnell's political allies claimed for him a complete acquittal. But the Report of the Commissioners showed that, though some other charges against Mr. Parnell were dismissed as unproved, the most important contentions of the *Times* were fully established. The origin and objects of the criminal conspiracy were placed beyond doubt; the association for the purposes of that conspiracy with the Irish-American revolutionists was most clearly made manifest, as well as the reckless persistence in boycotting and in the circulation of inflammatory writings after it was known in what those practices ended. Nor was it without significance that a confession was extorted from Mr. Parnell that he might very possibly have made a deliberately false statement for the purpose of deceiving the House of Commons. Indeed, on more than one point where Mr. Parnell's sworn testimony had to be weighed against that of other witnesses—as in the case of Mr. Ives and Major Le Caron —the Commissioners rejected it.

Nevertheless, the Gladstonians went out of their way to affirm their unshaken belief in the stainless honour of Mr. Parnell, to accept him as the model of a Constitutional statesman, and to base upon his assurances their confidence that a Home Rule settlement would be a safe and lasting one. Mr. Parnell received the honorary freedom of the city of Edinburgh. He was entertained at dinner by the Eighty Club; Mr. Gladstone appeared on the same platform with him; his speeches were welcomed at Gladstonian gatherings in the provinces as eagerly

as those of the patriarchal leader himself; and, finally, he was the late Premier's guest at Hawarden Castle, where the details of the revised Home Rule scheme, which have never been disclosed even to the National Liberal Federation, were discussed confidentially as between two potentates of coequal authority.

But a cruel disappointment was in store for credulous souls. Mr. O'Shea, whose intervention had brought about the Kilmainham Treaty, instituted proceedings against Mr. Parnell in the Divorce Court. It was denied up to the last that there was any ground for these proceedings; it was predicted that they would never come to an issue. But when, after protracted and intentional delays, the case came on in November last, it was found that there was no defence. The adultery was formally proved and was not denied, nor was it possible to explain away its treachery and grossness. The public mind was shocked at the disclosure; but those who were best entitled to speak were strangely silent. Mr. Gladstone said nothing; the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland said nothing; Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Mr. Healy, and the rest of the Parliamentary party hastened to Dublin to proclaim, at the Leinster Hall, their unwavering fidelity to Mr. Parnell. Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Brien telegraphed their approval from America. On the opening day of the Session Mr. Parnell was re-elected leader.

Meanwhile the Nonconformist conscience had awakened, and Mr. Gladstone responded to its remonstrances. His letter turned the majority round, and, after a violent conflict in Committee Room No. 15, Mr. Parnell was deposed by the very men who had elected him. He refused to recognise his deposition, and has fought a daring, but a losing, battle in Ireland ever since. The declaration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy against him, however, sealed his doom. The clergy have worked against him as they never worked in politics before. Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Brien have taken the same side. He has been defeated in North Kilkenny, North Sligo, and Carlow, and though he has been battling fiercely down to a few days ago, the ground has been visibly slipping away from him. Even his marriage with Mrs. O'Shea, the only reparation for his sin, has been turned against him in a Roman Catholic country, and was the excuse for the defection of the *Freeman's Journal*. It is not surprising that a feeble constitution should have broken down under such a load of obloquy and disappointment.

LORD LYTTON

1831–1891

Obituary Notice, Wednesday, November 25, 1891

A distinguished representative of a distinguished family, Lord Lytton was brilliant in many ways, without attaining to the very first rank in any of the various spheres of action in which he played a prominent part. Future historians will probably explain many of the peculiarities of his character and career by the principles of heredity. The family traces its descent from Sir Robert de Lytton, of Lytton, in the county of Derby, Comptroller of the Household to King Henry IV., and numbers among its members several men who did good service in their time; but the first two who became widely known were the uncle and the father of the peer whose untimely death we record to-day. The uncle was Lord Dalling, whose name is still remembered in Constantinople as an extremely able but somewhat eccentric Ambassador to the Porte from 1858 to 1865; and the father was Bulwer Lytton, the distinguished novelist and dramatist, whose works are so familiar to the elder section of the present generation.

In 1827 the novelist married Rosina Doyle, daughter of Francis Wheeler, Esq., of Lizzard Connell, county Limerick, and of this marriage was born, on 8th November 1831, the man who was to make, like his father, a name for himself in literature, who was to become Viceroy of India, and who has just died at the age of sixty as Ambassador to the French Republic. It is no secret that the relations between his father and mother were anything but cordial, and that a series of domestic crises ended, not only in a separation, but in a violent,

inextinguishable enmity on both sides. It may perhaps be doubted which of the parties in the ill-assorted union was most to blame, but there is no doubt that the domestic discord and the home surroundings in general had an injurious influence on the character and education of the son. It is here that the student of heredity will find ample scope for research and speculation, for the son was in many respects singularly like his father, whilst displaying strongly-marked characteristics of his own, which might, perhaps, be explained by his mother's idiosyncrasies. At an early age he showed symptoms of those cosmopolitan—some said un-English—tendencies which became very prominent in after life.

After spending some time at Harrow and subsequently with private tutors, he went to Bonn and devoted himself to the study of modern languages, but he did not go through a regular University course. His studies here, like his studies and pursuits at all periods of his career, had an unsystematic, dilettante character, and were more extensive than profound. What he probably would have liked to do was to saunter leisurely through life, culling the prettiest and most lusciously-scented flowers by the wayside and enlivening the monotony of existence by an occasional outburst of brilliant, spasmodic energy. His pecuniary means, however, did not allow him to enjoy the *dolce far niente* of the refined scholar. He had to enter a profession of some kind, and he was naturally apprenticed to the one which would enable him to live in foreign countries and indulge at least some of his intellectual tastes. When eighteen years of age he entered the Diplomatic Service, and was at once appointed, under his uncle, Lord Dalling, attaché at Washington. Here he remained about two years, and was then moved about from one post to another, according to the exigencies of the service and the prospects of promotion. The posts at which he resided included Florence, Paris, the Hague, St. Petersburg, Constantinople, Vienna, Copenhagen, Athens, Lisbon, and Madrid, so that he had an opportunity of making close acquaintance with many men and many cities before he reached the zenith of his official career.

It was during this period that Robert Lytton became known as a brilliant and agreeable man of letters under the pseudonym of Owen Meredith. Young diplomatists had in those days less official work than at present, and Owen Meredith loved litera-

ture much more than the routine, or even the more interesting studies, of diplomacy. In 1855 he published *Clytemnestra, and other Poems;* in 1860, *Lucile;* in 1861, *Tannhäuser, or the Battle of the Bards;* in 1863, *The Ring of Amasis;* and in 1874, his *Fables in Song.* His poems are decidedly remarkable both in thought and expression, and are distinguished by great elegance of diction, but they have nothing of the force and originality of a poetic genius of the first order, nor have they any of the sympathetic, homely qualities which sometimes endear a second or third rate poet to a large circle of readers. He had, in fact, a delicate, refined appreciation of poetry rather than a rich vein of poetic originality, and his powers of expression were much greater than his other poetic gifts. That he borrowed largely from other poets is unquestionable, but it is difficult to decide how far his plagiarism was conscious and intentional. In a sensitive, receptive nature like his, there was a strong temptation to absorb and reproduce, half unconsciously, the thoughts of other authors, whom he habitually read and admired. In the later years of his life he did not publish so much, but he continued to write verse, and in 1885 he published a long poem in six books called *Glenaveril*, which did not add much to his literary reputation.

In 1864 he had married Edith, second daughter of the Hon. Edward Villiers, and niece of the late Earl of Clarendon, and in 1873, on his father's death, he succeeded to the title as the second Baron Lytton. He had at that time reached the rank of First Secretary of Embassy, and, as his private fortune was not sufficient to satisfy his somewhat expensive tastes, he determined to remain in the Diplomatic Service. His diplomatic career, however, was soon to be interrupted. In January 1876 Mr. Disraeli looked for a Viceroy of India after his own heart, who would pursue *con amore* an energetic, forward policy in an Imperialistic spirit, with a certain pyrotechnic display for the purpose of obtaining popular applause. For such a policy Lord Lytton seemed to him an admirable instrument. If the author of *Tancred* had become a successful Prime Minister of England, why should not Owen Meredith, with his lively imagination and his keen sympathy with the pomp and pageantry of the gorgeous East, make a successful Viceroy of India? In any case the experiment seemed to be worth making, and the cautious, hard-working, methodical Lord Northbrook was

replaced by the showy young diplomatist and *littérateur*. The significance of this change soon became apparent.

Before the new Viceroy had been a year in India—on 1st January 1877—a magnificent durbar, to which all the princes and notables of India had been invited, was held at Delhi, and there, with a ceremonious pomp surpassing probably anything that had ever taken place in the days of the Mogul Emperors, Queen Victoria was proclaimed Empress of India. But it was not merely in matters of ceremonial display that the new *régime* manifested itself. The prestige of British rule in India was to be raised not only by the creation of the Imperial title, but also by the extension of British influence beyond the frontier. The direction chosen was to the north-east. In Afghanistan the Ameer Shere Ali had shown a spirit of insubordination, if not of positive hostility. He had refused to receive a permanent British Agent in Cabul, and he was known to be coquetting on the other side with the Russian authorities in Central Asia. The Cabinet of St. Petersburg had agreed, in 1873, to regard Afghanistan as beyond the sphere of Russian influence, but it chose to consider that agreement as invalidated by the hostile attitude of England during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78, and, in reply to the bringing of Indian troops to Malta, it despatched a mission under General Stolietof to Cabul. Shere Ali, who was embittered by his failure to obtain a British guarantee for his Sovereignty and family succession, and who was now being pressed to receive in his capital an unwelcome permanent diplomatic representative from Calcutta, determined to resist what he regarded as British aggression by leaning on Russian support. General Stolietof was accordingly received with all honour at Cabul, and Sir Neville Chamberlain with a British mission was turned back at the frontier. Such a rebuff could not be tolerated by a Viceroy who was expected to raise British prestige all over the East. War was therefore declared, and the campaign was at first remarkably successful.

Before a few weeks had passed, the Ameer had fled from Cabul with the Russian mission, and within six months from the commencement of operations the Treaty of Gandamak was signed. By that Treaty the frontier was rectified in accordance with Anglo-Indian interests, a British resident in Cabul was accepted, and the foreign relations of Afghanistan were subjected to English control. So far all had gone well, and Lord

Lytton had reason to congratulate himself on the success of his energetic "forward" policy. Then came a change. The Treaty of Gandamak was signed in May 1879, and on 3rd September of the same year, the Resident, Sir Louis Cavagnari, and his whole escort were massacred in Cabul, within a few yards of the house in which the new Ameer was sitting, inactive and apparently indifferent. Immediately an avenging force was despatched under General, now Sir Frederick, Roberts and fulfilled its mission ; but the whole country rose against the invader, and the British troops could not be withdrawn till July 1880, when Abdurrahman Khan, the present Ameer, was placed on the throne.

Thus Lord Lytton's policy might be regarded on the whole as successful, but the political results were not considered as at all in proportion to the sacrifices of blood and treasure, and the defeat of the British force at Maiwand made a deeper impression on the English public than the previous and subsequent victories. For the present, therefore, Lord Lytton's Afghan policy is pretty generally condemned, and there is no doubt that during the war very grave blunders were committed—strategical, political, and financial—but it would be hazardous to assert that posterity will confirm the condemnatory verdict. Regarding Lord Lytton as an administrator there is less scope for diversity of opinion. Though he could sometimes cause astonishment and admiration among his subordinates by the brilliancy and by the intuitive talent of his spasmodic efforts, he was incapable of prolonged systematic exertion, and his previous training had not prepared him for administrative work. He had no special talent for selecting the best instruments, nor the patience and perseverance required to control them when selected. Even as the upholder of British prestige in India, he cannot be regarded as a success. Though he had the Oriental love of display and an artistic eye for theatrical effects, he had not the calm, stately dignity which impresses Orientals, nor did he possess all the qualities which command respect among his own countrymen. His Viceroyalty naturally came to an end with the Beaconsfield Cabinet, and Lord Ripon was sent out by the Gladstone Government to undo much that had been done by his predecessor.

For seven years after his retirement from the Viceroyalty of India Lord Lytton lived as a private individual in England,

taking part occasionally in the debates which specially interested him in the House of Lords, but making no effort to attain an important position in English political life. His tastes lay rather in the direction of diplomacy and residence abroad, and they were gratified by his appointment as Ambassador in Paris in 1887. During the four years that he held this post he has proved that in an important diplomatic position and in a genial atmosphere he could display diplomatic qualities of a very high order. If we have maintained, under a Government strongly suspected of pro-German proclivities, more cordial relations with France than we did even under previous Cabinets which had a decidedly Gallophil tendency, it is to the sympathetic personality, sound judgment, and habitual tact of Lord Lytton that the result is mainly to be attributed.

THE EX-EMPEROR OF BRAZIL

1825–1891

OBITUARY NOTICE, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1891

"CALL no man happy till he dies" is the motto which is naturally suggested by the career of Dom Pedro. Little more than two years ago he seemed one of the happiest of sovereigns and of men, possessing everything that a man of taste and culture could desire, and having every prospect of ending his days as the beneficent Sovereign of a devoted and grateful people. In the course of a few hours all was changed. The Sovereign who had loved and served his country so well had become a fugitive and an exile, destined to suffer severe bereavements, and succumb to a painful illness in a foreign land.

Pedro II., De Alcantara—his Majesty had thirteen other Christian names—Emperor of Brazil for nearly sixty years, from 1831 to 1889, was born on 2nd December 1825. His father was Dom Pedro I. of Braganza and Bourbon, and his mother Leopoldina Carolina Josephine of Austria; he was consequently the legitimate descendant of three of the most ancient royal houses of Europe, Braganza, Bourbon, and Hapsburg. Dom Pedro I., son of John VI., abdicated the throne of Portugal in favour of his daughter, Donna Maria, on 2nd May 1826; and subsequently (April 1831), after a prolonged and hopeless struggle against a resolute and ever-increasing opposition, he abdicated the throne of Brazil in favour of his son, who was then only in his sixth year.

The early education of the young Emperor was conducted with the utmost care and solicitude, for upon his life hung the future of Brazil. His youth was passed amid the almost ceaseless

turmoils which followed the declaration of Brazilian independence, and from his accession until 1833 the Government was administered by a single Regent, Bonifacio Jozé de Andrade e Silva, formerly a leader of the Democratic party. A Council of Regency was then appointed, which continued until 1840. Fortunately, through the whole of this critical period statesmen of all political creeds and principles united in defending the welfare of Brazil and the rights of the Emperor, so that, even under the most threatening circumstances, the Brazilian constitution was preserved intact. In 1840 Dom Pedro II., while still under age, was declared by the Chambers to have attained his majority. He accordingly assumed the reins of government on 23rd July of that year, and the ceremony of his coronation was solemnised on 18th July 1841.

Few monarchs of the century have had a more extraordinary career than Dom Pedro. He had scarcely assumed supreme power when, in 1841 and 1842, a determined effort was made to substitute a federal government in place of the existing order of things; but the conspiracy was promptly and efficiently frustrated, and by the end of the latter year the whole Republican party was reduced to submission. Several Ministries, in which various parties predominated for a time, now governed the country till 1848; and during this period, chiefly by skilful negotiation, the rebellious province of Rio Grande was pacified. A serious quarrel with Great Britain, however, arose in 1848, owing to the neglect shown by the Brazilians in putting in force a treaty for the abolition of the slave trade, which had been concluded as far back as 1826. At the same time the Governor of Buenos Ayres, General Rosas, was again endeavouring to stir up revolution in Rio Grande. Yellow fever, hitherto unknown in Brazil, broke out in 1849, and it was attributed to the importation of slaves. The traffic was condemned by public opinion, and severe laws being passed against it, these were so firmly enforced that in the course of a few years not a single disembarkation took place.

In 1849 the Emperor, through the Ministry of Visconde de Olinda, entered into alliances with the Governors of Montevideo, Paraguay, and the States of Entre Rios and Corrientes, for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the Republics of Paraguay and Uruguay, which Rosas intended to reunite to Buenos Ayres, and the troops of Rosas, who besieged Monte-

video, were compelled to capitulate. Rosas then formally declared war against Brazil; but an army of Correntine, Uruguayan, and Brazilian troops, under General Urquiza, assisted by a Brazilian naval squadron, advanced on Buenos Ayres, completely routed the forces of Rosas, and crushed for ever the power of that dictator. Among the fruits of this intervention for Brazil were an acquisition of territory and the free navigation of the River Plate and its great feeders; and the latter result especially inaugurated a new era of general prosperity. Subsequently for many years Brazil was almost entirely free from intestine commotions; public works and education advanced, and the finances reached a degree of development previously unknown.

The Emperor despatched a squadron up the Paraná in 1855 to adjust several questions pending between the Empire and the Republic of Paraguay, the most important of which was that of the right of way by the Paraguay River to the interior Brazilian province of Matto Grosso. The right had been in dispute for a considerable period. The expedition failed in its purpose, and although the consequent discord between the States was afterwards temporarily allayed by a treaty granting to Brazil the right to navigate the Paraguay River, every obstacle was thrown in the way by the Paraguayan Government, and indignities of all kinds were offered not only to Brazil, but to the representatives of the Argentine and the United States Republics. The Emperor assumed a firm and judicious attitude in 1862, when a dispute arose between the Brazilian Government and that of Great Britain respecting the arrest of some British officers at Rio de Janeiro. The matter was referred to the arbitration of the King of the Belgians, who decided in the Emperor's favour, and this tended greatly to consolidate his power.

But the six years extending from 1864 to 1870 were a very trying period in the history of Brazil. In the first-named year Lopez, the ambitious dictator of Paraguay, seized without previous declaration of war a Brazilian vessel on the Paraguay, and rapidly followed up this outrage by an armed invasion of the provinces of Matto Grosso and Rio Grande in Brazil, and that of Corrientes in the Argentine Republic. The invaded States thereupon entered into an alliance with Uruguay, and the war which ensued was soon changed from an offensive one on the part of Paraguay into a defensive struggle within that Republic

against the superior numbers of the allies. Paraguay enjoyed such natural advantages, however, and Lopez had gained such ascendency over the people, that it was not until the year 1870, after the country had been completely drained of its manhood and its resources, that the protracted war was terminated by the capture and death of Lopez. The long duration of this war, with its frequent battles and sieges, involved an immense sacrifice of life to Brazil, the army in the field having been constantly maintained at from 20,000 to 30,000 men. The total war expenditure was calculated at upwards of £50,000,000, and large deficits in the financial budgets of the State resulted, involving increased taxation and the contracting of loans from foreign countries. Brazil acquired as a part of her war indemnity 1160 square miles of Paraguayan territory; and notwithstanding the financial and other evils accruing from the war, her sources of public wealth remained unaffected, and her commerce continued steadily to increase.

The greatest social reform of the late Emperor's reign, and one which will render it memorable in history, was the abolition of slavery. By the first abolition law, passed in September 1871, it was enacted that from the date of the measure every child born of slave parents should be free, and all the slaves belonging to the State or to the Imperial household were declared to be free from the same period. The Act also provided for an emancipation fund, to be annually applied to the ransom of a certain number of slaves owned by private individuals. From the passing of the Abolition Act the emancipation of slaves proceeded at a rapid rate, the work being largely promoted by the slave-owners themselves and by private philanthropy. It was estimated that from the cessation of the importing of slaves in 1853, and especially after the enactment of 1871, not less than a million slaves had obtained their freedom by the year 1876; and the total extinction of slavery within the Empire was confidently predicted at no distant date. This expectation, however, was not fulfilled, and in 1884 the Emperor complained to his Ministers that the authorities did not move as fast as popular feeling. Private generosity had liberated altogether 90,000 slaves, and 19,000 more had been set free under the provisions of the Rio Branco law at a cost of £80 per head; but even at this rate of progress it was seen that many years must elapse before the final emancipation of

the blacks—of whom in 1884 there were still 1,500,000 slaves —could be accomplished. Several provinces now voluntarily freed the slaves within their own borders; and with regard to the remainder, the Prime Minister, Senhor Dantas, acting in accordance with the wishes of the Emperor, introduced a Bill into the Chamber of Deputies with the object of bringing about the total abolition of slavery within ten or twelve years. The Bill was defeated by 59 votes to 52, and the Emperor dissolved the Chamber.

An appeal to the country followed, and the contest actually lay between the "abolitionists," who desired to secure for the slave gradual but full freedom, with efficient protection pending his definite manumission, and the "emancipators," who, while setting him nominally free, would keep him in cleverly-forged bonds. The result of the appeal to the country gave a nominal majority for the Prime Minister, but several Liberals were opposed to his proposals. Nevertheless, in opening the Chamber, the Emperor announced the determination of the Government to introduce its Emancipation Bill "for the purpose of gradually abolishing slavery in our country, in consonance with the wishes of all Brazilians." The Ministry was unable to make progress with its scheme, however, and eventually resigned. A Conservative Ministry, under Senhor Saraiva, was formed, and the new Premier brought in a modified emancipation measure, which was ultimately passed, under the auspices of Saraiva's successor, the Baron de Cotegipe, by a coalition of Conservatives and Liberals.

The principal features of the new Act were—a revised registry, liberation of slaves over sixty-five, liberation of slaves over sixty with a condition of three years' service, fixed official values of slaves, surtax of 5 per cent on all imposts except export duties, authorised emission of 5 per cent polices for liberation of slaves, five years' usufruct of slaves where proprietors wished to substitute free for slave labour, compulsory domicile of five years for all freedmen liberated by the fund under jurisdiction of police and under penalty of enforced labour for the State, compulsory service under labour contracts for all freedmen under penalty of imprisonment and judicial lease of services by arbitrary contracts, and the establishment of State agricultural colonies under military control as penal establishments for unemployed freedmen. Although the Act provided that in

seventeen years all slaves were to be free, it was anticipated that under the new scheme slavery would cease in seven years. At the close of 1886 there were about 1,000,000 slaves in the Brazils, as compared with 2,500,000 in 1850.

The general elections in 1886 gave a majority for the Conservatives. The Emperor opened Parliament in person, and Senhor Dantas introduced a measure for the complete emancipation of the slaves at the end of five years. The Bill was thrown out by the Chamber, but the abolitionists succeeded in getting a measure passed which put an end to the official flogging of slaves. Finally, in the Session of 1888, the question was set at rest by the Chamber of Deputies voting the immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery. As one immediate result of the emancipation laws in Brazil, considerable difficulty was experienced in procuring a sufficient supply of labour for the Brazilian plantations; but the general effect of the legislation was to give new directions for the employment of capital and the construction of railroads and telegraphs. The improvement of internal communication by roads and rivers was likewise largely promoted, and attention was strongly directed towards the further development of the provinces by the increase of European immigration. Enterprises of a social and commercial character greatly multiplied, and public instruction received a vigorous impulse.

His Imperial Majesty made the tour of Europe in 1871, visiting London, Paris, Rome, Florence, Brussels, and other capitals. In 1876 he went through the most interesting portions of the United States, and was present at the Centennial Festival at Philadelphia. He again visited Europe in the succeeding year, and his energy in viewing the "lions" of London on this occasion completely baffled the reporters and interviewers, who toiled after him in vain. He paid special attention to our art galleries, and made a round of visits to the studios of leading British artists. On his first visit the Emperor was received by the Queen at Windsor. During his reign the Emperor made several extended tours through his own dominions; and in 1867 he opened the navigation of the Amazon to the vessels of all nations.

In November of the year following the abolition of slavery, 1889, the apparently firm edifice of Imperial power fell, at the first touch, like a house of cards. As our Rio correspondent

wrote at the time, Brazil had in the course of eighteen months accomplished two revolutions. By the first no fewer than 700,000 slaves had been liberated. By the second a popular and patriotic Emperor was suddenly driven into exile ; and the country, when it recovered from its amazement, found itself a Republic under a military dictator. On the continent of South America there have been numberless revolutions, but none more bloodless, more swift, or more unexpected, than that of which Dom Pedro was the victim. His power was supposed to be secure, though it is probable that the emancipation of the slaves weakened his hold on the conservative classes of the nation ; but, however this may be, it is certain that the events of 15th and 16th November were anticipated by no one but the conspirators themselves, and least of all by the unsuspecting Emperor and his family. The Imperial system in Brazil did not, as in other countries, rest upon the army. The army, indeed, was by some of the Emperor's advisers dreaded rather than trusted, and it was generally believed to be for this reason that the Government was gradually dispersing it along the frontier and throughout the provinces. In fact, the immediate cause of the revolution was the refusal of the 7th Infantry Battalion to leave Rio. The army leaders had for some time been prepared to resist the further dispersal of the military forces, and the Republicans were ready to take advantage of the situation. When the 7th Battalion mutinied an endeavour was made by the War Department to coerce them.

On the morning of the 15th the whole Cabinet met at the War Office to compel the departure of the recalcitrant troops. Marshal Manuel Deodoro da Fonseca appeared on the scene, and was loudly cheered by the troops, who cried, "Down with the Ministry." Fonseca's movements were prompt and effective. He entered the room in which the Cabinet were sitting, and simply stated that he deposed them in the name of the army. While the Ministers were detained at the War Office for a few hours, the Republic was proclaimed in the streets. The Emperor arrived at the City Palace in the course of the afternoon, and spent an hour or two in endeavouring to form a new and more popular Ministry. These attempts were superfluous. At half-past five Fonseca issued a proclamation in the name of the army, the navy, and the people, announcing the abolition of the Monarchical Constitution and the establishment

of a Provisional Government. The next morning the Emperor was a prisoner in his palace ; and on the 17th he was, with all his family, on board the packet *Alagoas*, which the Provisional Government had chartered to carry him to Lisbon. The revolution was an accomplished fact, and, as none of the Imperial party made any resistance, was an absolutely bloodless success.

At Lisbon a trial of a domestic and of a severer character was in store for the unfortunate exile. He had not resided there more than a month when the Empress died. In his distress Dom Pedro left Lisbon and removed to Cannes, where, with the exception of a recent visit to Paris, he has since lived in retirement. It is probable that the unpopularity of the Princess Imperial contributed to his downfall ; and this circumstance may have furnished one reason, among others, for his abstention from the intrigues which some of his friends carried on with a view to his restoration. Both his friends and his enemies will admit that in exile and old age he bore himself with dignity and fortitude.

The ex-Emperor married, 4th September 1843, Donna Theresa Christina Maria, daughter of the late Francis I., King of the Two Sicilies. The Empress, who was a woman of great personal charm, only survived her husband's deposition six weeks, dying on 28th December 1889. By her Dom Pedro had four children, two sons and two daughters, but both sons died in infancy. The elder daughter, Isabel, who now becomes the representative of the claims of the House of Braganza to the throne of Brazil, was born in 1846, and married in 1864 Prince Louis of Orleans, Comte d'Eu. The Emperor's second daughter, Leopoldina, born in 1847, was married in 1864 to Prince Augustus of Sachsen-Coburg-Gotha, but she died on 7th February 1871.

Until November 1889 the late Emperor and his consort were believed to be universally beloved in Brazil for their intellectual and moral endowments and their affectionate interest in the welfare of their subjects. The Emperor was of a most active disposition, an excellent horseman, and assiduous in athletic exercises. When in Rio de Janeiro he was constantly to be seen in public ; and twice in each week he received his subjects as well as foreign travellers, invariably captivating both by his courteous manners. He wrote and spoke the English,

French, German, Spanish, and Italian languages with fluency and elegance. He was a liberal patron of letters, the arts and sciences, and of every branch of industry and commerce ; and it was with the view of conferring no empty honour upon him that he was elected a member of the Geographical Society of Paris in 1868, and corresponding member of the French Academy of Sciences in 1875. Dom Pedro was an ardent student of botany, a passion which is inherited by his daughter.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE

1808–1891

OBITUARY NOTICE, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1891

ALTHOUGH the Duke of Devonshire wielded great influence as the head of one of the leading Whig houses, his name is written yet more largely on the industrial progress of the country and upon the records of our learned Universities. Sir William Cavendish, seventh Duke of Devonshire, Marquis of Hartington, Earl of Devonshire, Earl of Burlington, Baron Cavendish of Hardwicke, and Baron Cavendish of Keighley, was born on 27th April 1808, being the great-grandson of the fourth Duke, and the grandson of Lord George Augustus Henry Cavendish, who was created in 1831 Earl of Burlington. His father was Mr. William Cavendish, M.P.; and his mother, Louisa, daughter of Cornelius, first Lord Lismore. In the year 1858 the Earldom of Burlington (to which the late Duke had succeeded in 1834) and the Dukedom of Devonshire were united in his own person.

The Cavendishes were a distinguished family many centuries ago. Sir John Cavendish was Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench in 1366, and in the fourth year of Richard II. his lordship was elected Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, an honour which his descendant now deceased had conferred upon him five centuries later. Sir John Cavendish was commissioned with Robert de Hales, Treasurer of England, to suppress the insurrection raised in the city of York. In the same year the mob, having risen to the number of 50,000, made serious raids upon the lawyers in the southern counties; and, being especially incensed against the Chief Justice Cavendish,

they seized upon him and dragged him, with Sir John of Cambridge, Prior of Bury, into the market-place of that town, and there caused both to be beheaded. The second son of this Sir John Cavendish was the person who actually killed the notorious Wat Tyler, and for this service he was knighted in Smithfield, and received a grant of £40 per annum from the King. Some time later one George Cavendish was the faithful attendant of Cardinal Wolsey through all his vicissitudes; and King Henry was so struck by his devotion that he retained him in his own service.

But the chief founder of the fortunes of the family was William Cavendish, who, in 1530, was appointed one of the commissioners for visiting and taking the surrenders of divers religious houses. In the above-mentioned year the Prior and Convent of Sheen surrendered their monastery to him. He subsequently received grants from the Crown, was knighted, and appointed Treasurer of the Chamber to the King; an office which he also filled in the reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Mary, when he was sworn of the Privy Council. He married three times, his third wife bringing him the large and valuable Hardwicke estates. One of his grandsons became that Duke of Newcastle prominent in the Civil Wars, but the title and honours died out. Sir William Cavendish received considerable grants of forfeited church lands from Edward VI., and he it was who commenced the erection of Chatsworth.

His son William, who owned three magnificent seats in one county—Chatsworth, Hardwicke, and Oldcotes—was created Baron Cavendish of Hardwicke in 1605, and Earl of Devonshire in 1618. His descendant, the fourth Earl, was the distinguished statesman and patriot who became the first Duke of Devonshire. Returned to Parliament for the county of Derby in 1661, he soon became a formidable opponent of the policy of the Court. In 1679, however, he was made a Privy Councillor by Charles II., but withdrew from the Board with his friend Lord Russell when he found that Romanist counsels prevailed. He made a bold Protestant stand, and appeared in defence of Lord William Russell at his trial, "at a time when it was scarcely more criminal to be an accomplice than a witness." He further showed his attachment to his friend by offering to exchange clothes with him, so that the condemned nobleman might escape.

He succeeded to the Earldom in 1684, and being a strenuous opponent of the Government of James II., he was one of the prime movers in the Revolution. "He was one of the seven who signed the original paper inviting the Prince of Orange from Holland, and was the first nobleman who appeared in arms to receive him at his landing." In 1694 he was created Marquis of Hartington and Duke of Devonshire, and on the same day the head of the house of Russell was created Duke of Bedford. As Macaulay observes, "The two great houses of Russell and Cavendish, which had long been closely connected by friendship and by marriage, by common opinions, common sufferings, and common triumphs, received on the same day the highest honour which it is in the power of the Crown to confer." The Duke was appointed by Queen Anne one of the commissioners for concluding the Union with Scotland, and this was the last public service associated with his name.

Another distinguished member of the family was Henry Cavendish, the eminent chemist and philosopher. On the female side the line has been celebrated for its beauty, as well as for its political zeal; and, though by birth a Spencer, it is as Duchess of Devonshire that the famous Georgiana, the fair enthusiast of Fox's time, who was credited with irresistible fascinations as a canvasser in the Whig interest, is remembered in history. Coming down to the immediate predecessor of the deceased, the sixth Duke, he will be remembered chiefly for his great social influence. In 1826 he was sent on a special embassy to Russia, as Ambassador Extraordinary at the coronation of the Emperor Nicholas. His Grace's retinue was of a very superb character, and his mission cost him, it was said, upwards of £50,000 beyond the allowance made by the Government. The Czar conferred on him the Russian Orders of St. Andrew and St. Alexander Newski, and the most friendly relations were established between Monarch and Ambassador. When the Czar Nicholas visited England, he was entertained by the Duke with princely hospitality. On the death of the latter in 1858, he was succeeded, as we have stated, by his kinsman, the second Earl of Burlington.

The late Duke was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he evinced great mathematical talent. Like many of his ancestors, his mind had a decided scientific bias, and he was also deeply interested in architectural and in engineering pro-

jects. He graduated M.A. as second wrangler and first Smith's prizeman in 1829, being also eighth in the first-class of the Classical Tripos, and the same year he was returned as one of the members for the University of Cambridge. His oratorical qualifications were not of a high order, and he played the part of an almost "silent member." "Hansard" records only one speech of his as member for Cambridge University, but that was on a very important subject. At the time of Mr. Cavendish's return for the University, the Reform question had already begun to assume formidable proportions, and was even then a "burning" one.

When the debates of 1831 and 1832 came on, it was of course expected that the voice of the representatives of Cambridge University would be heard on this all-engrossing topic. Mr. Cavendish's speech was brief, but his words were wise and weighty. Although he differed in opinion from a very considerable portion of his constituents, he gave an unqualified support to the whole of the Government measure. No one, he urged, was more sensible than he was that in many respects this country was fortunate beyond the ordinary lot of nations; but he was quite at a loss to see how that could depend on the existing borough system. But there was another consideration of paramount importance. Without the confidence of the country it was certain that no Government could go on. There could be no stability unless the great majority of the people supported the Government. At present that House was not the genuine representative of the people, and so long as that state of things continued the dissatisfaction of the public would continue to increase. That dissatisfaction might be smothered for a moment, but whenever any circumstance occurred to call it forth, it would burst out with redoubled violence. As for those who said that the Reform measure was only a stepping-stone to further concession, he could not see any weight in their argument—the tendency of which was, in fact, to throw obstacles in the way of all improvement. He was surprised at the clamour of revolution which had been raised against the Bill. It was his decided conviction that if revolution was to be apprehended in the country, it was not from that Bill, but from the continuance of a system which was completely at variance with the general interests. Nor would the measure promote the downfall of the aristocracy. It was true that it would deprive the aris-

tocracy of a portion of their immediate power; but it would induce them to rely not on their boroughs, but on that which always ought to be the sources of their legitimate influence—viz. their own talents, and their means of conferring happiness on the people.

This was a courageous speech on the part of the young member for the University, and it cost him dear. At the ensuing election he was rejected; but, as Lord Cavendish, he was afterwards returned for Malton. He sat for only a very brief period for this constituency, however, for in 1832 he was returned for North Derbyshire, and continued to represent this division until he succeeded to the title of Earl of Burlington in May 1834.

From that time onward we hear little of him in connection with politics, but he was very active in regard to the scientific and industrial concerns of the country. Perhaps the most notable enterprise with which the name of the Duke will always remain associated is that connected with the rise and progress of the town of Barrow-in-Furness, on the north-east coast of Lancashire. There is no more remarkable story in the industrial annals of England than this. The district was always famous for its veins of pure hematite iron ore, but so late as the beginning of the present century the annual export was only about 1000 tons, while the population so recently as 1847 only numbered 325. The railway was the first great aid to development, and in 1857, by the carrying of the line over Morecambe Sands, through communication was established between Barrow and Carnforth. In five years from this date the consignments of iron ore by ship and rail had risen to 250,000 tons per annum, and in five years more the amount had increased to 450,000 tons. Two companies of iron and steel works were established in 1859 and 1864, and in 1866 they were united under the name of the Barrow Hematite Steel Company (Limited). In September 1867 there were opened the Devonshire and Buccleuch Docks, constructed at a comparatively small cost, by the enclosure of the channel between the mainland and a small island, on which shipbuilding works have since been erected. The docks comprise an area of more than 60 acres, and are entered from Walney Channel by a gateway 60 feet wide. They give a uniform depth of 24 feet, the stone quays being a mile and a half long, and the wharfs sup-

plied with hydraulic cranes, one of which is capable of lifting 100 tons.

At the banquet given on 19th September 1867 the Duke of Devonshire presided, the Duke of Buccleuch (to whom also the town has been largely indebted) occupying the vice-chair. The Duke of Devonshire said he remembered the time when the population of Barrow was under 100, but by 1867 it had grown into a town of 20,000 inhabitants, requiring a municipal charter of its own. The source of its prosperity was the numerous beds of iron ore in the district, and the iron-works which had sprung up around the town. The opening of the Barrow Docks could not be considered uninteresting from a national point of view, for all the trade that Barrow might gain would be an addition to the trade of the country. Mr. Gladstone, who was an invited guest at the banquet, proposed "The Town and Trade of Barrow" and made complimentary references to the Duke and to those who were interested and associated in the progress of the town.

Barrow was incorporated, and Mr. James Ramsden, managing director of the Furness Railway Company and first Mayor of the borough, received the honour of knighthood in 1872 as an acknowledgment of the value of his work. A massive bronze statue to Sir James, the result of voluntary contributions, was erected in the centre of the town to mark the appreciation of his services by the community. An extension of dock accommodation has recently been provided in a series of basins called the Ramsden Dock, and having a water area of 200 acres. Passenger steamers run daily to Belfast, and there is also a regular service to Glasgow and the Isle of Man. By rail there is connection with Whitehaven, and with the London and North-Western and Midland systems, with branches to the Lake district. In 1881 the population of Barrow was 47,000, and in the present year it is nearly 52,000. The town has many handsome public buildings, while the beautiful ruins of Furness Abbey, founded by Stephen in 1127, lie within the borough, and about two miles from the centre of the town. The unexampled progress of Barrow added greatly to the wealth of the late Duke.

In the south of England also his Grace effected a work of considerable value in the development of the fashionable watering-place of Eastbourne. Its progress owes much to his

activity and capital. This favourite resort is situate about three miles to the east of Beachy Head, the loftiest headland on the British Channel. It once consisted of three small straggling villages; but these distinctions are now obliterated, and numerous handsome terraces and detached houses have more or less united the three old hamlets into one town. A pier was erected in 1868, and the population, which is constantly increasing, was 35,000 at the recent census. Compton Place, Eastbourne, was a favourite residence of the Duke. Buxton, in Derbyshire, also owes much of its recent development to the fostering care of the Duke.

When that important body the Iron and Steel Institute was inaugurated the Duke of Devonshire was chosen as its first president; and in 1872 a portrait of his Grace, painted by Mr. H. T. Wells, R.A., was presented to the Institute. Mr. Lowthian Bell, speaking on behalf of the subscribers, dwelt on the importance of having the Duke's name associated with the Institute —not to the iron trade of one district of the Empire only, but to every branch of it in every portion of the kingdom:—

"If they had sought the country through, it would have been impossible to have found a family within which could be ranked a more illustrious name than that of Cavendish, for, so long as science was venerated in this country and in the world generally, the great name of Cavendish, the chemist, could not and would not be forgotten. But that was not the only reason which guided the founders—if he might so term them—of that Institute in making the selection they did, when they asked his Grace the Duke of Devonshire to undertake the office and duties of their first president. His Grace himself, as was well known, ventured of his own free will into an arena where neither ancestors nor lineage could procure any advantage, and then, by the exercise of his own intelligence and industry, he obtained the highest meed of approbation and honour which it was in the power of their Universities to bestow. His colleagues and himself conceived that there was no man in the kingdom, as regarded the scientific view of the question, more fitted to undertake the duty than the Duke of Devonshire. There were many men in the position held by his Grace who preferred learned ease to undertaking the more active and onerous responsibilities of life. His Grace, however, had acted differently. He had not shrunk from undertaking the duties and responsi-

bilities connected with the initiation and development of certain great branches of industry in this country, and in promoting industry. He was sure he was correctly interpreting the sentiments of his Grace when he (Mr. Bell) said that the Duke felt he was adding lustre to his own brilliant name by so doing."

The Duke, in acknowledging the marked compliment paid him, observed that the foundation of the Institute would always be remembered as an important era in the history of the iron trade. His colleagues had co-operated with each other in an enlightened and liberal spirit, and had been influenced by one general desire to add to the common stock of knowledge applicable to the improvement of a great branch of national industry. So long as the same spirit continued to animate those who conducted the proceedings of the Institute, he felt that the organisation would be a powerful instrument for the advancement and progress of the iron and steel trades of Great Britain.

Another institution in which his Grace always took a deep and lively interest was Owens College, Manchester (Victoria University). To this and to the Yorkshire College of Science and other institutions he was a munificent contributor. As president of Owens College, the Duke delivered the inaugural address on the opening of the new college buildings, 7th October 1873. His Grace pointed out that the range of studies at the old English Universities had been greatly extended, and it was now very generally recognised to be the proper function and duty of a University to teach not only some few selected subjects, but every great and important branch of human knowledge on which the human faculties could be employed. To provide instruction coextensive with this vast field was the duty committed to the governing body of Owens College. He rejoiced that the objects of the College, as defined by its founder, had been steadily kept in view.

"It might possibly have been anticipated that in a place which owes so much to, and has become so celebrated as the seat of, the manufacturing industry, and where pursuits of that kind are so deservedly held in honour—it might have been anticipated that the older class of studies, those connected with literature, might have been pushed aside and comparatively disregarded. There might have been a danger that the application

of science would have been regarded as of more importance than the imparting of a sound preliminary scientific instruction. But, on the contrary, we find that the importance of combining literary and scientific studies has been from the first recognised both in principle and in practice. The experimental sciences have been taught in their full depth and breadth, not in a fragmentary or superficial manner, with any supposed reference to their immediate application."

The president also referred to the incorporation of the Manchester Royal School of Medicine, the acquisition of the Museum of Natural History and of Geology, and other matters.

With regard to the difficult question of University Reform, in which the Duke of Devonshire always manifested profound interest, and especially as it concerned the advancement of science, we may remind our readers that his Grace acted as Chairman of the Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction and the Advancement of Science. This Commission published a full and valuable report on the progress of scientific education and research in the two old Universities; and the report embodied many important proposals and recommendations for the advancement of scientific teaching. The report had due effect, and both Oxford and Cambridge have since made preparation for the development of scientific culture. The Duke himself set a noble example to the Universities by the gift of the Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge, in which the study of the physical sciences can be carried to the highest point.

The Duke's appearances as a speaker in the House of Lords were very infrequent; but he was a consistent supporter by his vote of all the great measures brought forward by the Liberal party. With the exception of occasional observations on University measures and cognate subjects, he only departed from Carlyle's golden rule of silence on one occasion, and that was when he spoke in favour of Mr. Gladstone's Irish Church Bill in the session of 1869. His Grace cordially and strongly supported that measure. He referred in his speech, made on the second reading, to the few occasions on which he had addressed the House, and to the importance of the crisis which had made him interpose then. He considered the word anomaly a very mild and inadequate one to describe the condition of the Established Church in Ireland. He should rather characterise it as a scandal to the Parliament and Government

of the country in having so long retained such an institution, in defiance of the religious feelings of the great majority of the Irish people. The Established Church in Ireland could in no sense of the word be called the National Church. After some remarks on the Church property his Grace said :—

"I regard this measure as indispensable for laying a foundation for the removal of that estrangement and alienation with which Ireland has so long regarded England. If this Bill should be rejected, what reason would there be, supposing its rejection could be permanent, for expecting that Ireland in the future would be anything different from what it has been in the past; and in such case could we contemplate such a prospect without utter despair? I believe this is the first step for the removal of one of the most frightful sources of discontent in that country; and as such I support it as one of the most just and beneficent measures ever presented to my consideration since I have had a seat in your lordships' House."

The Duke separated himself from Mr. Gladstone on his Irish Home Rule policy, to which he was strongly opposed. Although of recent years his Grace took little public part in politics, he accepted the position of chairman of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union. He was qualified for that position as a great Irish landlord, and one whose estates, in spite of his necessary absenteeism, were, by universal consent, admirably managed. The same may be said of his English estates in Derbyshire, Lancashire, and elsewhere. In spite of multifarious interests and occupations he found time to be a practical agriculturist. He was one of the original founders of the Royal Agricultural Society, and was president in 1869. For fifty years he has been a great breeder of shorthorns, and the Holker herd has a world-wide reputation.

The Duke was married in 1829 to Lady Blanche Georgiana Howard, daughter of the sixth Earl of Carlisle, and by her (who died in 1840) he had issue three sons and one daughter. He is succeeded in the title and estates by his eldest son, the Marquis of Hartington, the distinguished Liberal statesman. The Marquis now leaves the Lower House, in which he has long been a familiar figure. His lordship is unmarried. The Duke's second son was Lord Frederick Cavendish, M.P., whose brutal murder in the Phœnix Park, Dublin, in May 1882, excited a thrill of horror throughout the country, and at the

same time a feeling of profound and universal sympathy with his bereaved relatives. The third son, Lord Edward Cavendish, died last spring, and his son, Mr. Victor Cavendish, was elected to fill his father's seat. His Grace's only daughter, Lady Louisa, is married to Admiral the Hon. F. Egerton, M.P., son of the second Earl of Ellesmere.

The knighthood of the Garter was conferred upon the late Duke, who was also a Privy Councillor, an LL.D. of Cambridge, a Fellow of the Royal Society, etc. He was Chancellor of the University of London from 1836 to 1856, and Lord-Lieutenant of Lancashire 1855-58, when he was appointed Lord-Lieutenant of Derbyshire. He was High Steward of the boroughs of Derby and Cambridge, and a magistrate for Lancashire and Sussex. On the death of the Prince Consort he was elected Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. In private life his Grace was widely esteemed, though, being of a retiring disposition, he rarely, and of late years almost never, appeared in society in London. He was a liberal patron of the arts, and a supporter of every good measure for the amelioration of the people and the advancement of the claims of education and scientific research.

SIR WILLIAM WHITE

1824–1891

OBITUARY NOTICE, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1891

THE various changes in the Diplomatic service caused by the unexpected death of Lord Lytton have not yet been carried out when another Embassy becomes vacant by the equally unexpected death of Sir William Arthur White, her Majesty's Ambassador in Constantinople, at the age of sixty-seven. Sir William was a man of robust constitution and generally enjoyed excellent health, but about two years ago some of his friends and subordinates began to perceive symptoms of a change. He no longer showed the restless energy and insatiable appetite for work which had characterised him throughout his long and distinguished career in the public service, and he began to speak of seeking repose in retirement; but a visit to the German baths in the summer of last year restored him to health and energy, and after his return to Constantinople he expressed a hope that he might be able to remain at his post until the age of seventy, when ambassadors are expected to retire and make room for their younger colleagues. Until a few days ago there was no reason to apprehend that this hope might not be realised, and he left Constantinople in good spirits with the intention of spending Christmas with some members of his family in Berlin, but during the journey he caught a cold, and yesterday he succumbed to what the doctors explain as failure of the heart's action from an attack of influenza.

Sir William White is one of the few distinguished English diplomatists who may be called self-made men, and official success came to him late in life. His father is said to have

served in the Consular and Colonial service without attaining to any high official rank, and he was certainly not in a position to accelerate by powerful protection his son's advancement. It is generally supposed that the latter owed something to the patronage and assistance of a distinguished Polish family, of whom he used to speak occasionally with gratitude and affection, and he certainly possessed all through life strongly-marked Polish sympathies; but it may be remarked, as characteristic of his mind and disposition, that these sympathies for Polish nationality, though naturally strengthened by intimate personal relations with many of the leading Polish families, never obscured or biassed his judgment with regard to political events. Though he spoke Polish like a native, and had a Polish accent when speaking Russian, with which he was less familiar, he was entirely free from the semi-mystical political illusions in which so many of his friends and acquaintances indulged, and during his service in Warsaw he never compromised himself officially by his intimate relations with those who were regarded with not unfounded suspicion by the Russian Government.

Of his early years comparatively little is known, for he had none of that senile garrulity which delights in recalling the scenes and incidents of childhood and youth; and though endowed with a wonderful memory, and always ready to open to those who showed an intelligent curiosity in such matters the rich storehouse of his reminiscences, he preferred dwelling on incidents which had a historical rather than a merely personal interest. He was educated at King William's College in the Isle of Man, and afterwards spent some time at Cambridge, but in his schoolboy and student days he does not seem to have specially distinguished himself, and in his after life he never displayed any leanings towards academic culture or scholarship of any kind, unless we include under that term the study of modern languages, in the acquiring of which he had a remarkable natural facility. All his keenest interests lay in the present, and even his wide and accurate historical knowledge was all intimately connected with questions at present in course of solution. This tendency increased with advancing age. At some period of his life he must have read largely the ordinary works on mediæval and modern history, but in recent years he sought for information in newspapers and periodicals rather than in bulky volumes, and, after separating carefully

the seed from the chaff, he stored up the former in such a methodical way that it could always be produced immediately when required. Probably no man living—certainly no living diplomatist—ever read so many newspapers so intelligently and with so much advantage to himself, and the information so acquired blended harmoniously with his official knowledge and his personal recollections.

It was, perhaps, fortunate for him in the long run that he remained long in subordinate positions where there was comparatively little routine work to be done, for he had thereby leisure to study thoroughly in detail all the more important political questions connected with Eastern Europe. In an accurate knowledge of these questions he was certainly unsurpassed and possessed few rivals, and his wide experience of men and modes of procedure enabled him sometimes to counteract intrigues and secret action against which the ordinary diplomatist, however perspicacious and energetic, would have been powerless. Perhaps the best proof of his ability in this respect is the fact that he was not infrequently denounced by the intriguers as an intriguer, when they happened to find their secret plans checkmated. It is much to his honour that these accusations are unfounded, for he possessed many of the qualities required for successful intrigue, and was often under great temptation to use them, though no casual observer could have suspected the existence of such qualities from his exterior. His frank, open countenance, unrestrained manner, stentorian voice, and a certain quasi-bucolic unwieldiness in his movements did not in the least suggest the diplomatist of the Macchiavellian type; and yet no man understood better the intricacies and wiles of Oriental diplomacy, or displayed more presence of mind and adroitness in dealing with them.

His ability in dealing with Orientals must, it is true, be attributed in part to the fact that his whole official life was spent in Eastern Europe. From 1857 till 1864 he lived in Warsaw—first as clerk to the Consulate-General, then as Vice-Consul, and lastly as Acting Consul-General. His next post was that of Consul at Dantsic, where he remained till 1875, when he was appointed Agent and Consul-General in Servia, which was then only a vassal State, but which afforded him an opportunity of displaying his diplomatic talents and utilising his very exceptional knowledge of Eastern politics. At that

time the Eastern Question was rapidly approaching one of its periodically acute stages. An insurrectionary movement, secretly favoured by Austria, had broken out in Herzegovina, and the excitement rapidly spread to the neighbouring Montenegrin and Servian Principalities, where it was actively fomented by Russia. In 1876 the Servians, under the command of the Russian General Tchernayef, invaded the Turkish vilayet of Nish with the intention of marching on Constantinople ; but they were soon repulsed, and were only saved from a Turkish occupation of their own country by the energetic intervention of the Cabinet of St. Petersburg.

This brief campaign, together with " the Bulgarian atrocities," led to the Conference of Constantinople, which held its sittings in December 1876 and January 1877. Lord Salisbury went in person to Constantinople to take part in the proceedings, and took with him the British Agent and Consul-General in Servia as a specialist well acquainted with all aspects of the questions to be discussed. From this time dates Sir William (then Mr.) White's rapid promotion. His extraordinary knowledge of principles and details made a deep impression on Lord Salisbury, and, when it was considered necessary to have an exceptionally well-qualified representative in the new kingdom of Roumania, he was appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Bucharest. In April 1885 he was appointed to fulfil temporarily the duties of Ambassador in Constantinople during the absence of the regular Ambassador, and here he had an opportunity of displaying diplomatic talents of a still higher order. When Eastern Roumelia was annexed, by a revolutionary movement, to the Principality of Bulgaria, there was at first a general consensus among the Powers that this flagrant infraction of the Treaty of Berlin could not be tolerated, and Russia took the lead in insisting on the re-establishment of the *status quo ante.*

Sir William White was the first to perceive that such a policy was not in accordance with the interests of the majority of the Great Powers, and especially with the interests of England, and he succeeded not only in persuading his own Government and that of Austria to adopt a contrary line of action, but also in ultimately bringing about the official recognition of the *fait accompli.* He thus contributed powerfully to the consolidation of the Bulgarian Principality, and the Bulgarians are

evidently well aware of the fact, for when he passed through the country last year, on his way to a German watering-place, he had considerable difficulty in preventing a public demonstration being made in his honour, and it required all the personal influence of Mr. O'Conor, our representative in Sofia, to restrain the Bulgarian Government from carrying out its intention of showing at an inconvenient moment its gratitude towards the friend of Bulgarian nationality.

In 1886 Sir William was appointed Special Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Constantinople, and since that time he has continued to occupy that post. As the Eastern Question has remained in a comparatively dormant state during that period, he has not had much scope for extraordinary activity, but he has been ever vigilant and has exercised no inconsiderable influence on current affairs, so that when the history of the Eastern Question during the last fifteen years comes to be written the name of Sir William White will occupy in it during the whole of the period a distinguished and honourable place.

SIR GEORGE AIRY

1801–1892

OBITUARY NOTICE, TUESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1892

SIR GEORGE AIRY'S name is one that has never come prominently before the general public, though for sixty-five years it has been a familiar and honoured name in the great world of science. So far as we know, the only work by him which has a professedly popular stamp is a little book entitled *Popular Astronomy*, which has passed through numerous editions, but which is really intended "to explain to intelligent persons the principles on which the instruments of an observatory are constructed." The fact is, the late Astronomer-Royal's mind was rigidly scientific, we might almost say rigidly mathematical. Any scientific problem or scientific theory, or, indeed, any application of science which could not be made to square with his severely mathematical tests, he was apt to regard with distrust. It may be remembered that in the early stages of construction of the Forth Bridge he wrote at considerable length to prove that no bridge built upon the principles which were being applied could possibly stand. But in the peculiar position which Sir George Airy had to fulfil as Astronomer-Royal, these little failings probably leaned to virtue's side. The great business of his life was to deal practically with mathematical astronomy, to reconstruct a great observatory, and to carry out its chief object —astronomical observations on mathematical lines. This, his great life-work, he accomplished with a masterly completeness that left nothing to be desired.

Sir George Airy was born at Alnwick, Northumberland, on 27th July 1801; he was educated at private schools, at Here-

ford and Colchester, and at Manchester Grammar School, from which he passed in 1819 to Trinity College, Cambridge, as sizar. He was elected scholar in 1822, graduated as Senior Wrangler in 1823, and was elected a Fellow of his college in 1824. His love for mathematics was developed at a very early age, and he began at once to apply them to astronomy and to certain branches of physics. Thus in 1824-25 he published papers on "The Lunar and Planetary Theories," on "The Figure of the Earth," on "The Undulatory Theory of Optics," on "The Forms of the Teeth of Wheels," and on "Escapements." In 1826 he was elected Lucasian Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge. He continued to devote himself to experimental philosophy and applied mathematics, at the same time showing a genuine interest in a wide range of subjects in the exact and physical sciences. Undulatory optics especially occupied much of his attention. In 1828 he was elected Plumian Professor of Astronomy, to which was attached the direction of the Observatory, and in this position his peculiar genius as an observer and as a director of astronomical observations at once manifested itself. From this time onwards Sir George Airy's activity was ceaseless, and its results were of the highest moment to the particular branch of science with which his name was so intimately associated. He devised a perfect routine for taking the various classes of observations, which greatly contributed to their scientific and practical value. At the same time he continued to give diligent attention to the theoretical departments of his science, and in 1831 published a paper of great importance, "On the Inequality of Long Period in the Motions of the Earth and Venus." In 1832 he wrote for the British Association a report, which is still of value, on "The Recent Progress of Astronomy."

Some three years later, on 1st January 1836, Professor Airy, as he was then, entered upon the great work of his life, being appointed Astronomer-Royal in succession to Mr. Pond. The fact that this appointment rests with the First Lord of the Admiralty is significant of the originally close connection of Greenwich with the art of navigation. It may be of interest to recall the fact that the Observatory was built in 1675, and that the first Astronomer-Royal was John Flamsteed, who reigned from 1675 to 1719. He was succeeded by Edmund Halley, whose successors were James Bradley, 1742 ; Nathaniel Bliss,

1762; Nevil Maskelyne, 1765; John Pond, 1811; and George Biddell Airy, 1835. The new Astronomer-Royal set himself at once to renew the equipment and to reform the routine and the methods of the Observatory. The first of the new instruments was not, however, erected till 1847, and, like all the other instruments, it was made after his own designs. The end to be attained by this new instrument (an altazimuth) was to make observations out of the meridian as accurate as observations in the meridian, and its main object was the observation of the moon. This led to a great improvement in the tables of the moon, as it enabled the astronomers to double the number of observations of our satellite. Among the other new instruments which were erected under the superintendence, and after the designs of, Sir George Airy were a new meridian circle, a "reflex-zenith-tube," to replace the Troughton zenith-sector, a new equatorial, a double-image micrometer, and the orbit-sweeper for detecting comets approaching the perihelion passage. In fact, by 1859 there was not a single person or instrument in the Observatory that had been there in Mr. Pond's time. During Sir George's long tenure of office the observations were made with absolute and uninterrupted regularity, and were carefully reduced and placed freely at the disposal of all who could make use of them. These observations, with the annual reports which he presented to the Board of Visitors, form a collection of astronomical *data* of great bulk and of the highest value, which in themselves will form a permanent monument to Sir George's genius as an observer and organiser.

But he did not confine himself to the routine work of the Observatory. Another monumental undertaking was the reduction of the Greenwich lunar and planetary observations since 1750. This arduous task was begun in 1833 and completed in 1848. As Professor Winnecke (to whose memoir on Sir George Airy in the "Scientific Worthies" series in *Nature* we are indebted for much of the information in this article) says, our present tables of the motions of the moon and of the planets rest for the greater part on the bulky volumes which contain these reductions. Many other series of reductions were undertaken under Sir George Airy, all of them of the utmost value in exact astronomy. At the same time, it was his duty to organise other undertakings more or less directly connected with the work of which he had charge. Thus, in 1842 he

visited Turin to observe the total solar eclipse ; in 1851 he visited Sweden for the same purpose ; and in 1860 he organised the eclipse expedition to Spain. On him also fell the long and arduous preparations for the equipment of the British expedition for observing the transit of Venus in 1874 ; as long ago as 1848 he was occupied with the subject. In 1847 he visited Russia to inspect the new central observatory in that country. Though Sir George was not as ready as some to recognise new departures in his science, he nevertheless showed a creditable liberality of spirit and practice in this respect. At a very early period of his career he introduced magnetical and meteorological observations at Greenwich, and at a later period he recognised the new astronomy so far as to organise heliographic and spectroscopic services at the Observatory. But Sir George did much other useful work both inside and outside the Observatory. Thus we may mention his experiments on the deviation of the compass in iron-built ships ; his researches on the density of the earth by observations in the Harton Colliery ; his services in fixing the breadth of railways, and in introducing a new system for the sale of gas. He was chairman of the Commission appointed to consider the general question of standards, and of the Commission intrusted with the superintendence of the new standards of length and weight, after the great fire which destroyed the Houses of Parliament in 1834. He conducted the astronomical observations preparatory to the delimitation of the boundary-line between Canada and the United States, and aided in tracing the Oregon boundary. He retired from his office at Greenwich in 1881, after forty-five years of service.

We have only referred to a few of the important contributions which Sir George Airy made during his long career to the noble science with which his name is so intimately associated. He was not only a man of stupendous industry, great accomplishment, and highly-trained intellect, but, it must be evident from what has been said, of considerable originality of conception and invention. If he made no stupendous discovery in science, his contributions to the store of astronomical knowledge, directly and indirectly, are of such bulk and high value that his name must live in the history of scientific progress in the nineteenth century. As Director of the Greenwich Observatory his discipline was severe ; but evidently reform was necessary, and, in an institution where precision and regularity

of routine are of the utmost importance, severity of discipline is an error on the safe side. Sir George was ever accessible to those desirous of making use of his great knowledge and skill. He was a man of essentially simple nature and habits, whose heart was in his work, and who did not value excessively the social advantages which his position gave him. We cannot but recall the fact that Sir George Airy diverged into theology in his *Notes on the Earlier Hebrew Scriptures* (1876), with no more satisfactory results than were achieved by Newton. He was also a man of antiquarian tastes, and occasionally wrote on his hobby in the *Athenæum* and elsewhere.

Sir George was President of the Royal Society from 1871 to 1873; he was made a C.B. in 1871, and a K.C.B. in 1872. He was medallist of the French Institute, of the Royal Society (twice), of the Royal Astronomical Society (twice), and also of the Institution of Civil Engineers, for suggestions on the construction of bridges of very wide span. From Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh he received honorary degrees; while of many scientific societies at home and abroad he was an honorary member. On his retirement in 1881 he received a pension of £1100.

Among the more important works by Sir George Airy may be mentioned *Treatise on Errors of Observation* (1861), *Treatise on Sound* (1869), *Treatise on Magnetism* (1870), besides contributions to the *Penny Cyclopædia* and the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, on such subjects as "Gravitation," "Trigonometry," "Figure of the Earth," and "Tides and Waves."

TEWFIK PASHA, KHEDIVE OF EGYPT

1852–1892

Obituary Notice, Friday, January 8, 1892

Mohammed Tewfik, son of Ismail, ex-Khedive, grandson of Ibrahim, the victor of Konieh, and great-grandson of Mehemet Ali, had neither the great virtues nor vices of his ancestors. If he was incapable of consolidating Egypt into a semi-civilised State within twenty years of anarchy, of drilling raw recruits into seasoned troops and threatening the very walls of Constantinople, of stimulating by his vigorous will the productiveness of his country, he was equally incapable of those deeds of barbarity which disgraced his ancestors, and which are only partially to be excused by their ignorance and the necessities of the times in which they lived.

Mohammed Tewfik was born on 15th November 1852, the son of a fellah woman of mean rank. Neither mother nor son appears to have enjoyed much affection from Ismail, who succeeded to the Viceroyalty ten years later. His younger sons he educated at Paris, Oxford, and Woolwich; but Tewfik was educated in Egypt, and had only once been in Europe, and for a very short time. It is probable that Tewfik profited rather than the reverse by this intentional neglect of his education. His brothers have shone more in society, and never hesitated to conceal their contempt for their less polished brother; but, if he developed more slowly, he showed qualities more sterling than the rest of his family,—qualities which not inaptly fitted him for the *rôle* he was called on to perform.

In the year 1866, Ismail, prompted mainly by dislike of the heir-presumptive—his uncle Halim Pasha—succeeded in altering

the established order of succession. Under the original treaties the Viceroyalty was to descend to the eldest living male descendant of Mehemet Ali; under the new it was to descend, in European fashion, from father to son. It is believed that Ismail was under the impression that he would be allowed himself to select the son that should succeed him, in which case it would not have been Tewfik; but the Powers intervened, and Ismail found that he had only changed his heir from an uncle whom he hated to a son whom he despised. Still, having to recognise Tewfik as heir-apparent, he established him in a palace at Koubeh, near Cairo, and married him in 1873 to Emineh Hanem, daughter of El Hamy Pasha, another great-grandson of Mehemet Ali. From this date to 1878 Tewfik's life was uneventful; he lived on his estate, took an interest in farming, and acquired the reputation of a juster landlord and of a fairer master than generally falls to the lot of an Egyptian fellah, while the carefully-preserved tombs of pious men which dotted his fields gave him a reputation for strict orthodoxy.

In 1878, Ismail, having unceremoniously dismissed Nubar Pasha as chief of the Ministry, in which Sir C. Rivers Wilson and M. de Blignières held portfolios, required a respectable figure-head as nominal President of the Council. It was not an unhappy inspiration that led him to name his son Tewfik, who, although only 26, and utterly ignorant of affairs, had acquired a reputation among Europeans and natives alike for the good taste with which he had abstained from the numerous intrigues which then infected Cairo. His enemies, chiefly of his own family, were good enough to explain this attitude as due to absence of intelligence, but it is fair to say that on accepting the position he showed more intelligence than his astute father by saying, "If I am young when I take office I shall not be much older when I leave it." During the few months that the Ministry lasted he did little more than confirm the general opinion that he was equally wanting in ambition and tendency to intrigue. Finding that much was done in his name that he could not approve, and a great deal more that he did not understand, he fulfilled his own prophecy and resigned.

On the morning of 26th June 1879, while walking in his garden at Koubeh, a servant approached him hurriedly and saluted him as "Effendina," *i.e.* Khedive. It is stated on authority, which may be correctly termed the highest, that the

unfortunate messenger had his ears boxed by the Viceregal hands. Sherif Pasha followed immediately after and confirmed the news. Ismail had received a telegram from Constantinople instructing him that he was deposed, and Sherif handed Tewfik another from the same source, instructing him to proclaim himself Khedive the same day. At three o'clock that afternoon every flatterer of Ismail's had deserted him, and while Tewfik was being proclaimed Khedive at the Citadel amid an enthusiastic crowd, including officers who had solemnly sworn forty-eight hours before to die for Ismail, the ex-Khedive was playing backgammon with a solitary Englishman, apologising for being unable to offer him coffee because he had no servants. The relations between Ismail and his son were naturally not improved by the sudden change in their respective positions, yet at no time did either behave with greater dignity. Within a week Ismail had left the country, and Tewfik, left alone, began the task of governing Egypt.

It must be confessed that his start was a very bad one, but even an abler man than he was might have found it difficult. This is not the place to enter into the question of the prudence or imprudence of the policy which deposed Ismail, but it ought to have been realised that it is dangerous to destroy one authority before you have decided on a substitute. There was neither authority, power, nor respect; there was simply an inexperienced youth of good intentions, surrounded by interested adventurers, left to establish order with a dissatisfied people and a disaffected army. For four or five months there was administrative anarchy, from which the re-establishment of the Dual Control (10th November 1879) rescued the country. In the choice of the controllers the British and French Governments did their utmost to repair the evil they had done. M. de Blignières was a talented Frenchman with a considerable knowledge of the country and no little tact. Sir Evelyn (then Major) Baring gave promise of what he has since shown—a power of governing the country. During 1880 and 1881 Tewfik was Khedive and the Dual Control governed.

Major Baring had been succeeded by Mr. (now Sir) Auckland Colvin as English Controller, when the deplorable weakness of Riaz Pasha's Government fomented that disaffection in the army which Ismail had first created, and which the unfortunate policy of the Gladstone Government finally fanned into a

rebellion. The attitude of Tewfik Pasha during those events has been subject to much severe and ignorant criticism. He was accused of alternately hectoring the rebels and cringing before them; it is perfectly true, but it only serves to show that Tewfik carried his loyalty to England and France so far as to imitate their every action. Nor, indeed, had he any other alternative, unless he had shown that want of confidence in his allies which would have been regarded as a still greater crime.

He was told to be obdurate, and he remained so until he found his head in chancery. He was then told to be conciliatory, and he distributed decorations. He was then, with fine humour, told to be dignified, and he was so until he was kicked, when he was exhorted to show a Christian spirit and forgive. When ultimatums came, supported with men-of-war, he was courageous. When the ultimatums were withdrawn and he was told that no men could be landed, he was less so. When soldiers did arrive he felt joyful until he learnt that their ammunition was at Cyprus, when he became sad. No man—outside of a British Cabinet—was ever placed in so humiliating or ridiculous a position, and few men would have acted better. Under compulsion of his own army on the one side, and of British men-of-war on the other, he endeavoured to maintain a neutrality benevolent to his own existence. There are English Ministers, under less dangerous circumstances, who have been known to do as much.

On 8th July 1882 the attitude of Arabi decided the British Admiral to send an ultimatum threatening to bombard the forts unless they were handed over to him. Before doing so, he earnestly counselled the Khedive to leave the city and to seek a place of safety. Mr. Auckland Colvin, speaking as British Controller, and to some extent on behalf of Sir Edward Malet, whose health had given way, urged the same course, which was supported by all his advisers, European and native, as well as by personal friends. It was pointed out to him that there were 6000 hostile troops in the forts, and that the population could not be trusted to refrain from outrage in the event of either victory or defeat; that his own yacht was in the harbour; that either the P. and O. mail steamer then in port or any of the men-of-war of neutral Powers would afford him protection. To all these counsels Tewfik had but one answer—"I am still Khedive, and I remain with my people in the hour of their

danger." Only at the last moment did he consent to put himself actually beyond the reach of the shells at his palace of Ramleh, three miles outside the town. Here even his life and that of the Vice-Reine, who loyally stood by him, were in the greatest danger ; the rebel soldiery surrounded the palace, and with difficulty he made his escape back through the flaming streets of Alexandria to his palace of Ras-el-Tin, when he reluctantly consented to a guard of British bluejackets. After the battle of Tel-el-Kebir he returned to Cairo, and commenced, under the guidance of Lord Dufferin, his *rôle* of a constitutional Monarch. He accepted cordially the reforms proposed to him, contrary as they must have been to all his own instincts, and loyally supported them with his influence.

Tewfik had shown courage during recent events, but the cholera, which made its appearance in 1883, was destined to put it to a perhaps yet more severe test. He was at Alexandria in comparative safety when the deaths at Cairo amounted to 2000 a day. Of his own initiative, in opposition to the advice of every one, he insisted on returning to the capital, accompanied only by his wife, who declined to desert him. Here he made the tour of the hospitals, conversed with the patients, and showed less anxiety than the doctors who accompanied him.

Early in 1884, on the arrival of Sir Evelyn Baring—this time as Diplomatic Agent and Consul-General—he was called upon to assent to the abandonment of the Soudan, the greater part of the territories to the government of which he had succeeded. There can be no doubt that it was with considerable hesitation that he gave his consent, but, when it was once given, he again showed no hesitation in using all his influence to insure the successful carrying out of the policy. General Gordon, who, in his attachment to the ex-Khedive, had used harsh words of his successor, was the first to admit that he had been mistaken in his estimate of the man, for Tewfik was above showing any petty resentment, and gave him every assistance in his power.

In the year 1886 he was again placed in a difficult position by the mission of Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, whose language in the House of Commons referring to the events of 1882 had not unnaturally given him great offence ; but in the delicate negotiations between himself, Sir Henry, and Mukhtar Pasha,

he preserved an attitude of equal friendliness to the representatives of her Majesty and of the Sultan. The abortive result of those negotiations was not unpleasing to him, for his respect for the Sultan, as the spiritual chief of his religion, was not inconsistent with a decided distrust of his motives in matters temporal, and in Sir Evelyn Baring he had learned to have that absolute confidence which a strong mind imposes upon a weaker.

It must not, however, be supposed that the late Khedive was as utterly wanting in strength of character as it is the fashion to represent him in the French Press. It is perhaps natural, but hardly logical, to assume that a man who declines to come under your influence must be of a very weak character; and we may be perfectly certain that, had Tewfik consented to be the tool of any of the numerous French Consuls-General in Cairo, his character for firmness of purpose would have stood very high with our neighbours. As a matter of fact, on more than one occasion the late Khedive showed not only that he had a will of his own, but that he knew how to exercise it. He chose a moment when Sir Evelyn was absent from Egypt to dismiss Nubar and to appoint Riaz, and when, in his turn, he disagreed with Riaz he dismisssed him equally without consultation with Sir Evelyn. The members of the new Ministry were appointed on his own initiative, and one of them, Fakry Pasha, has been similarly dismissed and his successor appointed. In matters connected with irrigation, education, and justice he took a strong personal interest; his views, if not always shared by his advisers, were always honest and frequently very shrewd. He was long in making up his mind, painstaking and almost tedious in his inquiries, but when he had at last arrived at a conclusion, he sometimes surprised his advisers by the amount of sagacity he showed. That in any matter of vital importance he must subordinate his own opinion to that of her Majesty's Government he recognised as the condition of English support, and we have shown that he loyally gave effect to the understanding; but in matters of administration he was not only encouraged, but urged by Sir Evelyn Baring himself to take an active part. The inexperience with which he commenced his reign and the natural diffidence of his character rendered the task a difficult one, but, with the steady pertinacity which was one of his most striking characteristics, he had latterly very

considerably increased both his power and influence in the country.

In private life Tewfik was amiable and unassuming, though not without a quiet dignity when he found it necessary to assert it. Unlike most Orientals, he was fond of talking of his wife and family, and when his sons were travelling on the Continent he used to read their letters, written in many languages, to any visitor who expressed an interest in them. To his wife he was devoted, and he practised the monogamy which he earnestly preached.

His eldest son Abbas, who succeeds him, was born in 1874. He is intelligent, has travelled in most countries of Europe, and speaks English, French, German, Turkish, and Arabic.

CARDINAL MANNING

1808-1892

Obituary Notice, Friday, January 15, 1892

By the death of Henry Edward Manning, Cardinal Priest of St. Andrew and St. Gregory on the Caelian Hill, and Archbishop of the Roman Catholic See of Westminster, English society loses a striking and a venerable figure, and the Church of Rome a titular prince, one who was at once a ruler and a servant of conspicuous ability, of many-sided talent, of strongly-marked character, and of absolute devotion. The passing away of Cardinal Manning carries the memory of men back to the most troublous times in the modern history of the Church of England; it brings to us the duty of following the eventful career of the man who had his share in bringing the Church of England into grievous danger, who advanced the cause of the Church of Rome in England farther than any man, except Cardinal Newman, has been able to advance it since the days of the Reformation, who was, in short, one of the two most eminent of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastics of the century in this country. A regard for the law of historical perspective renders it necessary to pass lightly over the story of the boyhood and early manhood of the embryo Cardinal, not because that story were not pleasant enough in the telling, but because it is a matter of primary importance to follow with close care the course of events which led Archdeacon Manning to desert the church of which he was an ornament, and to join the foes of that church; and because the Cardinal Archbishop who grew out of the Anglican Archdeacon took a leading part in stirring times, attained to the highest place but one in the Roman Catholic hierarchy, shone

in controversy upon vital matters, and made his opinions felt, and exercised his personal influence strongly amongst a people brought up to regard the Roman Catholic religion, its methods, and its instruments, as abominations.

Henry Edward Manning was born on the 15th of July 1808, the son of Mr. William Manning, who was a member of Parliament and a man of considerable repute in the mercantile community of the City of London. Upon attaining proper age the boy Manning was sent to Harrow, amongst his contemporaries at the great public school being Charles Wordsworth, afterwards Bishop of St. Andrews, whose recent work gives a vivid picture of life at Harrow in the early years of the century, and Chenevix Trench, afterwards the brilliant Archbishop of Dublin. Manning's boyhood was spent, then, under the influence of that public-school system which, according to critics who speak for the most part without personal experience in the matter, is calculated to run the characters of boys into one common mould, and to thwart every tendency towards independence and originality of thought. Harrow School did not so affect young Manning's character. From Harrow Manning proceeded with a high reputation to Balliol College, Oxford, and his academical career was of a brilliant description. It ended in a double first in 1830 and a Fellowship at Merton. His success, however, was not that of a mere bookworm. He took a genuine interest in the life of the University, and the books of his contemporaries seldom fail to mention the handsome and eloquent Balliol man who was always ready to speak at the Union on any subject. A comparison of dates shows how it was that Manning, endowed with a mind singularly calculated for the reception and advancement of the Oxford Movement, is mentioned but rarely in the numerous books bearing on the origin and early days of the movement. Newman, who had seven years' advantage over Manning in age, and, by reason of having come up to Oxford early, at least nine years of academical seniority, had surprised all his friends by obtaining an Oriel Fellowship long before Manning matriculated. Tait, known in his Oxford days principally as one of the "Four Tutors" who attacked Tract 90, did not come up to Balliol from Glasgow until the year in which Manning took his degree. The two future archbishops met, however, in the rooms of Moberly, then Tait's tutor, afterwards Headmaster of Winchester

and Bishop of Salisbury; and an extract from the diary of the great Protestant Archbishop records with a certain grim irony the fact that he, a timid undergraduate, was introduced to Manning as "an eminent bachelor and a safe friend." W. G. Ward must have matriculated about the year when Manning took his degree; J. B. Mozley was Manning's junior by four academical years; Hurrell Froude had secured his Fellowship at Oriel by the time that Manning matriculated. Of course the movement was brewing while Manning was at Oxford, but it did not take a definite shape until after Keble's famous sermon on national apostasy, and it took that formal shape principally in small meetings of close friends in Oriel Common Room and at Mr. Rose's neighbouring rectory.

Now the sermon on national apostasy was preached in 1833, and in 1834 Mr. Manning, having accepted the Rectory of Lavington and Graffham, in Sussex, left Oxford. He had, however, been well known at Oxford, and in his graduate days he was one of a society in Merton Common Room where the debates were as keen and interesting as those in which W. G. Ward and Tait took part in the Common Room at Balliol. That he threw himself into his clerical work with all his heart and soul there is abundant evidence. If any further proof were needed it would be found in the fact that at the early age of thirty-two he was appointed Archdeacon of Chichester; for men are not made archdeacons at thirty-two, unless they have given proofs of that tireless energy and organising power which are essential to the due performance of the duties of the archidiaconate. Archdeacon Manning was a busy man, but, business notwithstanding, he found time to keep abreast and in sympathy with, even to take his part in, a movement which commended itself to his mind as supporting that doctrine of the divine mission and heirship of the Anglican Church, and that theory that the Church by law established was entitled to stand above the law in matters of doctrine, which were, in his opinion, the essential conditions of its being a church at all. Hence comes it that, if we do not find him taking part in the *conciliabula*, as Newman used to call them, of the great leader of the movement, of Hurrell Froude, Marriott, Isaac Williams, and the rest of the familiar characters, we do find in the long series of masterly archidiaconal charges preserved in the British Museum abundant proof that his whole mind was with the

movement. In his church and parish Archdeacon Manning was something of an autocrat, insisting, according to the Rev. T. Mozley, that those who attended service too late for the confession and absolution had no right to attend at all, and marking his displeasure by stopping the service until the late-comers had taken their places. Mr. Mozley adds an amusing story of an old lady who, in her hurry to escape the public notice thus thrust upon her, fell down, and turned out to be the stern Archdeacon's mother. Mr. Mozley has also placed upon record an interesting correspondence between himself and Archdeacon Manning upon the subject of Convocation, the revival of which attracted much interest in the middle of the century. Meanwhile events were marching rapidly in the religious world. The publication of Tract 90 and the indiscreet eccentricities of W. G. Ward had prepared the way for the protest against Mr. Newman's teaching, and the transfer of the movement to the world at large. Then Archdeacon Manning began to take a more active part, and we find him classed with Mr. Gladstone by Dean Church, who, as a Fellow of Oriel and one of the Proctors who checked the persecution of Ward, and as a calm student, knew and understood the movement to a nicety, and so classed as one of the strong and noteworthy men into whose hands passed the control of the movement which shocked the Evangelicals and inspirited the Romanists.

An event was soon to come which was destined to be the turning-point in Archdeacon Manning's career. The Tractarians were already suspected of Roman proclivities, and not without reason. Newman, Ward, Dalgairns, and others had seceded; it was commonly prophesied that the ultra-High Church Archdeacon, the keen student of theology, would do the same. Some years earlier he had married Miss Sargent, a sister-in-law of Bishop Wilberforce. Her death had now removed one bar between him and the Roman priesthood. Some, indeed, said that he was a Roman Catholic at heart already. An incident, which was in all probability accidental, gave colour to these suspicions. Archdeacon Manning was intimate with a certain nobleman and his wife; he was said to be their spiritual director; he was one of the officiating clergy when the lady in question laid the foundation-stone of a church near St. Asaph, which was to be built at her expense and at that of her

husband, for Anglican purposes. In the interval between the laying of the foundation-stone and the time when the structure was ready to be consecrated the donors seceded to Rome, while Archdeacon Manning remained ostensibly a member of the Anglican Communion. The truth of the matter was, in all probability, that the Archdeacon had not realised in his own mind, perhaps he had not allowed himself to realise, the point to which his theories concerning the position of the Church had carried him. There were plenty of men in those days who seemed only to be waiting for an opportunity to resist the Royal supremacy. In the year 1833, for example, we find the saintly Mr. Keble writing to Mr. Newman, "Next, as to my own feelings, I think my mind is made up thus far, that I cannot take the oath of supremacy in the sense which the Legislature clearly now puts upon it. I cannot accept any curacy or office in the Church of England ; but I have not made up my mind that I am bound to resign what I have. Indeed, I rather think not, now that I have given public notice in what I differ from their construction. Also, I am convinced of the propriety of preaching and otherwise preparing one's flock for some trial of their Church principles." Certain it is that the Royal supremacy in its particular manifestation of the appellate jurisdiction of the Crown was a difficulty in the way of many earnest and zealous men of the High Church party, who could not be content to regard the legal position of the Church of England as "a happy anomaly," to use the words of Dr. Newman in his Anglican days, and who could not console themselves adequately by the reflection that, when all is said and done, the appellate jurisdiction of the Crown is called into use extremely seldom. It may well have been the case that Archdeacon Manning, unwilling to take the momentous step of migrating to another Communion while the independence of the English Church, which was for him the first principle of its existence, remained practically untouched, albeit theoretically liable to be invaded by the secular Courts, was waiting for that trial of the principles of Churchmen which Mr. Keble predicted. It came to him in the form of the Gorham case, which shocked and startled many more moderate men. The Bishop of Exeter had refused to institute Mr. Gorham to the vicarage of Bampford Speke on the ground that his published opinions concerning baptismal regeneration were heterodox. The Privy Council decided ulti-

mately, on appeal, "that the doctrine held by Mr. Gorham is not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England." The result was that many "old-fashioned Churchmen," as Dr. Davidson puts it, were scandalised, and that the High Churchmen were furiously indignant.

There was no man in whom an almost uncontrollable indignation burned more violently than in Archdeacon Manning, and he gave expression to his own feeling, and to that of many of his brethren, in an elaborate letter addressed to his Bishop, and entitled "The Appellate Jurisdiction of the Crown." The letter showed the militant Archdeacon in one of his most remarkable aspects—that is to say, as a controversial writer of the very highest order. The argument was learned without being pedantic, subtle without falling into obscurity, concise, articulate, and well proportioned; the tone was that of absolute conviction. The Archdeacon urged that the Divine office of the Church as guardian of the doctrine and discipline of the Church had been violated; that legal protection had been given to a denial of an article of the universal creed; that Divine doctrine had been brought down to the level of human opinion. He maintained that it was idle for those who exercised the appellate jurisdiction of the Crown to protest politely that they were not judges of doctrine when, as a plain matter of fact, the issue involved was doctrinal, and doctrinal only. In truth, the Tractarians had formed an idea of the independence of the Church which was not consistent with the legal position of Establishment, and Archdeacon Manning, having received that idea in all its completeness, could not consistently with honesty remain an Anglican minister. But it is possible for men to reach the conclusion that they cannot remain in the Anglican Communion without coming to the further conclusion that Romanism is the only alternative. Dr. Pusey and Dr. Liddon, for example, were compelled at one time to announce to Archbishop Tait that, if the proposal for "mutilation" and "degradation" of the Athanasian Creed, desired by Lord Shaftesbury, was carried into effect, they must resign their offices in the Church of England. It does not follow that they would, after resignation, have sought refuge at Rome. It does not follow that because a man thinks one system wrong he should think another system right. It becomes necessary, therefore, to look into this letter, which contains a more temperate and logical description

of the state of Archdeacon Manning's mind than anything which he wrote after secession, for something to show us why, being dissatisfied with Anglicanism, he was constitutionally inclined to be satisfied with Romanism. We find it in the characteristic quotation from Waterland, commonly used by him in after years, which describes the tendencies of the man in a single phrase. "Scripture is not Scripture save in the sense of Scripture." Combined with that mental and moral incapacity to accept anything in the nature of a compromise, which has been noticed already, we see that desire and readiness to be told what to believe and to be told precisely, that craving for an absolute spiritual authority upon which to rely implicitly, which were characteristic of the Archbishop of Westminster, who not only defended but welcomed the doctrine of infallibility in after years.

So, in 1851, Archdeacon Manning was received into the Roman Communion; and the circumstances of the time were such as to render his secession a serious blow to the Church of England. The times, be it remembered, were those of great excitement. In obedience to a Papal Bull, "given at St. Peter's, Rome, under the seal of the Fisherman," the Roman Catholics had parcelled out England into territorial sees. Lord John Russell had written the famous Durham letter, in which he raised the cry of "No Popery," and deplored "the danger within the gates from the unworthy sons of the Church herself"; and, on the top of the excitement caused by the Durham letter, had introduced his ill-judged and futile Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. The presence of Cardinal Wiseman in London added to the popular apprehension; the popular apprehension and the visible sign of fear in Parliament, in the shape of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, against which Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, Mr. Cobden, and Mr. Roundell Palmer strove in vain, caused the hopes of Rome to run high. It was in the midst of these circumstances that one of the most brilliant and promising of the Anglican clergy deserted the faith in which he had been reared; not for the sake of ambition clearly, since he relinquished the practical certainty of becoming a bishop at the least; not from pique, the cause assigned for Dr. Newman's secession by those who knew not the purity of his mind, since no affront had been put upon him; but from sheer conviction, and against interest. Rome had cause to rejoice. In ten years she had secured Newman, Dalgairns, and Manning, to say

nothing of others of less note; and Rome's joy was England's sorrow.

The Vatican had not to wait long before the last of the recruits showed his quality. In 1852 Mr. Manning delivered in Southwark, and published later, four lectures upon the "Grounds of Faith," containing a bitter and scientific attack upon Anglicanism. Still harping upon the old text, "Scripture is not Scripture save in the sense of Scripture," which was the keynote of his character, he insisted that there could be no knowledge without definition, no definition without authority; then, in questionable taste, having regard to the recent date of his conversion, he sneered at "the huge crumbling Protestantism" of the last three centuries, asking, in a tone which supplied the answer to the question, whether it could reach up to the original Revelation, whether it could claim "a succession of sense, reason, memory, and consciousness uniting it with the day of Pentecost." In short, one of the most formidable controversial writers of the century, a man armed with a knowledge of every weak point in the Anglican harness, had placed his splendid abilities at the disposal of the Church which was her principal foe.

Of the Manning of following years we have a portrait and a caricature, both drawn from the life by a master's hand, in *Lothair*. It was always an open secret that Father Manning, promoted by anticipation, was the model for Cardinal Grandison. The portrait leaves nothing to be desired; it cannot be improved. "Above the middle height, his stature seemed modified by the attenuation of his form. It seemed that the soul never had so frail and fragile a tenement. . . . His countenance was naturally of an extreme pallor, though at this moment flushed with the animation of a deeply interesting conference. His cheeks were hollow, and his gray eyes seemed sunk into the clear and noble brow, but they flashed with irresistible penetration." The rest is caricature. Father Manning was an ardent seeker after proselytes, and went about his work with judgment, but he did not use all the arts of the Jesuit. He was constitutionally disposed to asceticism; but to make Cardinal Grandison say, "I never eat and I never drink," was to lay to the charge of Father Manning an affectation which he did not show. Father Manning was the bitter enemy of the Establishment, but it is permissible to doubt

whether he ever said anything quite so pungently epigrammatical as "Perplexed churches are churches made by Act of Parliament, not by God." Still, the caricature, so long as we remember that it is a caricature, gives us a vivid impression of Mr. Manning as he lived and acted and spoke during the years in which he was laying the foundation of a power destined to be greater than that exercised by any Roman Catholic priest in England during the century. True it is that *Lothair* was not published until 1870, but the years to which it refers are those which followed upon the secession of Archdeacon Manning.

Such a man could hardly fail to be a notable figure at any time; and Father Manning's career was watched with particular interest by the old English Catholics, who, while they acknowledged his power and ability, regarded his manner of working with distrust and disapprobation. They were, to use a Scotch Catholic's words, a "small but varra respectable body"; they saw in Manning one who had clearly determined to use all his ability to spread Roman Catholicism among the masses. It was, indeed, something new for the Roman Catholics of England to see more clearly every day that one of the most eminent Catholic priests in the country, a man of extraordinary refinement and ability, a man of more than commonly aristocratic appearance, was animated by democratic instincts of the most unmistakable kind, and determined to make the poor recognise Roman Catholicism as an instrument of social reform and regeneration. With the death of Cardinal Wiseman in 1865 came the promotion to the Roman Catholic See of Westminster of the convert of 1851 and the discomfiture of the old English Catholics. They brought to bear all the influence that they could command, but Pius IX. had always evinced a strong partiality for the sometime Archdeacon, seeing in him a man of strong ability and a man firmly determined upon a policy which might be more likely than the traditional policy of the Roman Catholics in England to bring about that "conversion of England" to which the Vatican is supposed continually to look forward. So Mr. Manning was made Archbishop of Westminster, in spite of the then unrepealed Ecclesiastical Titles Act, of which nobody took any notice, and in spite of the dissatisfaction of the old Catholic families of England. Very soon he obtained an opportunity of showing his controversial

skill upon a subject after his own heart. The project of holding a great Œcumenical Council had long been under consideration. In 1869 it was realised, the most striking result of its realisation, so far as the outer world was concerned, being the promulgation of the doctrine of Infallibility. To Dr. Newman the doctrine presented great difficulties; though he of course accepted it, he appeared to do so with limitations; he deplored the moment of promulgation as ill-chosen. To the Archbishop of Westminster the doctrine presented no difficulties whatsoever; on the contrary, the tendencies of his mind, already indicated by his writings, were such that the idea which troubled many earnest Catholics, which was practically unintelligible to Protestants—some of whom it shocked as blasphemous, while others were simply amused—presented itself to him in the light of a solution of difficulties. Archbishop Manning's pastorals of 1869 and 1870 supported the doctrine with vigour. In 1875 Mr. Gladstone, to the great annoyance of the Irish Catholics, rushed into controversy, arguing that the doctrine was inimical to liberty. Mr. Gladstone's "Expostulation" was answered by the Archbishop with "The Vatican Decrees," in 1875, and the "True Story of the Vatican Council," in 1877. Both disputants showed marvellous skill of fence, but they started from different planes of thought. Nothing could exceed the Catholic Archbishop's subtlety of phrase; his definition, by way of description, of Infallibility as an analytical expression to account for the stability of the Roman faith, as being not a quality inherent in the person, but an assistance inseparable from the office, was a masterpiece of skill. But the fact remained that the doctrine, no matter how skilfully it was supported and explained, had widened greatly the gulf between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, and had shattered any hope which the High Church party may have entertained of the ultimate union of the Churches. Meanwhile the known goodness and power of the Archbishop had procured for him the high honour of being chosen as one of the princes of the Church, and his appointment as Cardinal was almost simultaneous with the publication of the Vatican Decrees.

But Cardinal Manning was not merely a controversialist and a scholar. He was an active prelate, a powerful preacher, and a man with a voracious appetite for hard work. His work

among the poor had a double motive. On the one hand he was actuated by genuine sympathy for the poor and oppressed, and particularly for the children of the poor. Intent, in the first place, upon improving their position and raising them in the social scale, he laboured among them to much purpose, paying particular attention to the question of the housing of the poor, on the Commission concerning which he did excellent service by virtue of his experience, in 1884 and 1885. He was also deeply interested in educational questions, and in this connection he consented to sit upon the Commission of 1886. An ascetic by temperament and conviction and a daily witness of the evils of intemperance, he instituted the League of the Holy Cross, a temperance association which has been unquestionably effectual for good, particularly in the East End of London. In short, he was a true friend to the poor, and he worked among them with true sympathy. But, on the other hand, it must be remembered that the Cardinal's zeal in these matters went hand in hand with an ardent desire for the "conversion of England," and that it was a part of his policy to show the Roman Catholic Church to the poor in the character of a deliverer. It is not, however, necessary that this should depreciate our estimate of the character of his work, for, after all, he would have been no true Roman Catholic if he had not striven to push Roman Catholicism, and the prospects of national perversion were at all times too dim and distant to affect the situation. Still there was one class of matters in which the Cardinal interfered in a manner which gave lasting offence. Englishmen have always been jealous of priestly interference in domestic matters and in matters of business.

The part which the Cardinal, together with an exalted prelate of the Church he had left, played some years ago in connection with an unsavoury and sensational agitation, which resulted in a sentence of imprisonment for Mr. W. T. Stead, did not tend to enhance his reputation with his countrymen. Nor were they greatly edified when they again saw him associated with an Anglican Bishop, the First Magistrate of the City, and an ambitiously philanthropic member of Parliament, in an endeavour to settle the dock-strike in 1889. Calm men said at the time that the peacemakers were interfering to no purpose in matters which they could not understand. But the popular clamour silenced the protests of prudent men, and practically

coerced the majority of the directors into an entry upon negotiations under circumstances repugnant to their consciences. For the moment the truce made seemed to be the answer to all protests, but two years had not elapsed before it was manifest that the settlement had not been final, and that the men, no less than the masters, regretted that inexpert interference had been permitted.

Mr. Tillett, in a speech delivered during the Carron Wharf strike, announced that if ever another Mansion-House agreement was signed the signatories should not be outsiders, but the men concerned. The sentiment was applauded to the echo. In the meanwhile, albeit there was not a strike in the south of England but that somebody said something about the Cardinal, his influence in labour disputes had decayed. He had tried, together with some Nonconformist imitators, to interfere in the gas strike; and upon Mr. Livesey's making plain, with courtesy but with firmness, his determination to manage his own affairs, he had rebuked him as roughly as if he had been an impertinent schoolboy or a recalcitrant neophyte, and Mr. Livesey, declining to submit to this treatment, had left the room. No doubt the Cardinal, who would not understand that, as a matter of fact, there was no strike, since the places of the strikers had been filled, thought his anger was just. No doubt, after forty years' ministry in a religious system based upon the notion of the all-pervading authority of the Roman Catholic Church, he found some difficulty in realising that Englishmen, rightly or wrongly, are determined to manage their own business in their own way, and are almost morbidly jealous of priestly interference. Be that as it may, the incident was the end of the Cardinal's influence in labour disputes. In secular politics the Cardinal did not take an active part, until the Home Rule question came to the front, when he embraced with ardour the policy afterwards advocated by Mr. Gladstone, with whom, in spite of wide divergence in ecclesiastical matters, he had maintained a friendship throughout his life.

For the last year or more of his life the Cardinal was not prominently before the public mind, but to the end there were many men, not merely Roman Catholics, but Nonconformists and Churchmen, who were prone to consult him on points of difficulty. Upon all such men the Cardinal produced a deep impression, nor did any one of them fail to speak of him with

affectionate regard. To the mass of Englishmen, after the secession of many of the Tractarians had ceased to be felt as a present shock, the Cardinal appeared as a venerable and picturesque figure in English life. The English Church, perhaps by reason of a just security, in the proper sense of the word, has grown vastly tolerant of late towards the Roman Catholicism which it does not fear either as a temporal power or as a spiritual enemy. It reeled, as Mr. Disraeli wrote in the preface to *Lothair*, under the blow inflicted by the secession of Dr. Newman; it almost reeled a second time under the wound inflicted by the perversion of Archdeacon Manning, who was formidable as an enemy, whereas Dr. Newman was most damaging while he remained a friend. But when all was said and done, when men began to turn round and review the results of the two great perversions, it was found that the Church was not weaker. Hence comes it that of late years the charm of Cardinal Manning's character, his devoted piety, his strong personality, his confident sincerity, his great talents and not less great attainments, have been recognised by men opposed to him in creed as well as by those who were at one with him. After exercising for many years an influence in English life such as no Roman Catholic ecclesiastic since the Reformation has possessed—an influence, indeed, of the most exceptional kind—Cardinal Manning has now been released from a long life of energetic and striking labour. England loses in him a man of striking character and strength, and mourns his loss even at a ripe old age without nice inquiry into the merits of his opinions. The Church of Rome loses in him a venerable prince of the Church, perhaps the most brilliant of her sons of the English race. He lived beyond the allotted span, devoting splendid abilities unsparingly to the service of the communion which he adopted.

MR. SPURGEON

1834–1892

OBITUARY NOTICE, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1892

BY the death of Mr. Spurgeon English Nonconformity has been deprived of a remarkable man, a man of striking power and strong personality, a man who has left upon the religious life of his generation a mark deeper, if less wide, than that which will be left by his contemporary of the Salvation Army. The British Islands have not failed to produce leaders of religious thought as generation followed upon generation, from the days when Tacitus spoke of *inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo tamen subdita*, even until now. In the religious leader who has gone to his rest the English-speaking world has lost a man of great power, of shrewd common sense, of remarkable influence; a man who could answer far better than the majority of men that searching question of Carlyle's: "Man, what is thy work?"

If there be such a thing as heredity in religion, then Charles Haddon Spurgeon was a hereditary Puritan. Mr. Spurgeon took just pride in his religious proclivities which he inherited from his ancestors; and in a sermon preached not many years ago he adverted to the subject: "When I spoke the other day with a Christian brother, he seemed right happy to tell me that he sprang of a family which came from Holland during the persecution of the Duke of Alva, and I felt a brotherhood with him in claiming a like descent. I daresay our fathers were poor weavers, but I had far rather be descended from one who suffered for the faith than bear the blood of all the emperors within my veins." As a matter of fact, the immediate ancestors

of the late Mr. Spurgeon were Nonconformist ministers. His father, John Spurgeon, preached to an Independent congregation on Sundays for sixteen years in Essex, and then became a regular pastor, first at Cranbrook, then in Fetter Lane, and last at Upper Street, Islington. His grandfather, James Spurgeon, was for more than half-a-century pastor of the Independent Church at Stambourne, in Essex. Mr. Spurgeon's ancestors were, in fact, among those Protestants from the Netherlands who settled on the East Coast to avoid religious persecution in their own country; and it is recorded that they were not entirely free from persecution in their adopted country, since one of them, at the least, "suffered imprisonment for conscience' sake" in the time of Charles II. Charles Haddon Spurgeon himself was born on the 19th of June 1834, at Kelvedon, in Essex. Much of the embryo pastor's early life appears to have been spent under the care of his grandfather at Stambourne, and that early life appears, according to all the numerous accounts which have been written, to have been of a highly characteristic nature. An admiring biographer wrote in 1887: "The pious precocity of the child soon attracted the attention of all around him. He astonished the grave deacons and matrons who called on his grandfather on Sabbath evenings by the serious, intelligent questions he asked, and by the pertinent remarks he made." "It is said on good authority," continues the biographer, "that before he was six years old he publicly reproved sinners in the street." *Se non è vero è ben' trovato*, and the same observation applies to the story concerning a certain backsliding member of the Independent community at Stambourne who appears to have been addicted, albeit not beyond the bounds of moderation, to the use of beer and tobacco. The backslider's account appears to have been to the effect that the child confronted him in the village ale-house with upraised finger and the words, "What doest thou here, Elijah?" These accounts may, of course, be apocryphal; they may be the mere legends, illustrative of man's capacity for hero-worship and saint-making, which have grown round the history of the childhood of Charles Spurgeon; but the probability is that they have at least a substratum of truth in them, and it may well be imagined that the child who was to become one of the most determined and one of the most confident of preachers, started in life with considerable capacity for believing in the correctness of his own views.

Another story, told by Mr. Spurgeon himself in a sermon preached in 1887, belongs to the same period :

"When I was a young child staying with my grandfather there came to preach in the village Mr. Knill, who had been a missionary at St. Petersburg, and a mighty preacher of the gospel. . . . Then, in the presence of them all, Mr. Knill took me on his knee and said, 'This child will one day preach the gospel, and he will preach it to great multitudes. I am persuaded that he will preach it in the chapel of Rowland Hill, where (I think he said) I am now the minister.' He spoke very solemnly, and called upon all present to witness what he said. Then he gave me sixpence as a reward if I would learn the hymn 'God moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform.' I was made to promise that when I preached in Rowland Hill's chapel that hymn should be sung."

The prophecy was fulfilled to the letter, but that is no great matter, since, humanly speaking, the chances were much in favour of young Spurgeon's becoming a minister, and of his being asked, some day or other, to preach in Rowland Hill's chapel ; but the interesting part of the story is in the clear evidence it affords that Charles Spurgeon showed power and promise even in very early youth.

Charles Spurgeon's education was not of the best. He appears to have gone to a school at Colchester, at seven years old, and to have stayed there for four years. For three years more we may presume that he was kept to lessons of some kind, and in 1848 he appears to have spent some time at an agricultural college at Maidstone. In 1849, when he served for a short time as an usher in a school at Newmarket, and, in the following year, when he was beset by sceptical doubts, he underwent that mental, moral, and spiritual process of conversion (at a Primitive Methodist chapel) which was placed in evidence by his public baptism at Isleham, Cambridgeshire, in 1850.

A sermon preached in 1856 gives an account of the process in language curiously illustrative of Mr. Spurgeon's preaching method :

"I resolved to visit every place of worship in Colchester, that I might find out the way of salvation. I felt willing to be anything and to do anything if God would only forgive me. At last one snowy day,—it snowed so much I could not go to the place I was determined to go to, and I was obliged to stop on

the road, and it was a blessed stop for me,—I found rather an obscure street, and turned down a court, and there was a little chapel. I wanted to go somewhere, but I did not know this place. It was the Primitive Methodists' chapel. I had heard of these people from many, and how they sang so loudly that they made people's heads ache; but that did not matter. I wanted to know how I might be saved, and if they made my head ache ever so much I did not care. So, sitting down, the service went on, but no minister came. At last a very thin-looking man came into the pulpit and opened his Bible and read these words: 'Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth.' Just setting his eyes upon me, as if he knew me all by heart, he said: 'Young man, you are in trouble.' Well, I was, sure enough. Says he, 'You will never get out of it unless you look to Christ.' And then, lifting up his hands, he cried out, as only I think a Primitive Methodist could do, 'Look, look, look! It is only look,' said he. I at once saw the way of salvation. Oh, how I did leap for joy at that moment! I know not what else he said: I did not take much notice of it, I was so possessed with that one thought. Like as when the brazen serpent was lifted up, they only looked and were healed. I had been waiting to do fifty things, but when I heard this word, 'Look,' what a charming word it seemed to me! Oh, I looked until I could almost have looked my eyes away, and in heaven I would look on still in my joy unutterable. I now think I am bound never to preach a sermon without preaching to sinners. I do think that a minister who can preach a sermon without addressing sinners does not know how to preach."

Converted by the Primitive Methodists, in so far as he was convinced of sin at one of their meetings, Mr. Spurgeon nevertheless remained a Baptist, with a touch of Calvinism at heart.

Very soon after his conversion he became a member of a lay preachers' association at Cambridge, and preached in the neighbouring villages, earning his living as an usher in a school at Cambridge during the week.

In 1852, Mr. Spurgeon, being eighteen years of age, became pastor of the Baptist Church at Waterbeach, and, not long after this, he escaped that more complete education which his parents desired to give him by a ludicrous accident, his account of which may be given in his own words:

"Soon after I had begun, in 1852, to preach the word in Waterbeach, I was strongly advised by my father and others to enter Stepney (now Regent's Park) College, to prepare more fully for the ministry. Knowing that learning is never an encumbrance, and is often a great means of usefulness, I felt inclined to avail myself of the opportunity of attaining it, although I believed I might be useful without a college training. I assented to the opinion of friends that I should be more useful with it. Dr. Angus, the tutor of the college, visited Cambridge, where I then resided, and it was arranged that we should meet at the house of Mr. Macmillan, the publisher. Thinking and praying over the matter, I entered the house at exactly the time appointed, and was shown into a room where I waited patiently for a couple of hours, feeling too much impressed with my own insignificance and the greatness of the tutor from London, to venture to ring the bell and inquire the cause of the unreasonably long delay.

"At last, patience having had her perfect work, the bell was set in motion, and, on the arrival of the servant, the waiting young man of eighteen was informed that the doctor had tarried in another room, and could stay no longer, so had gone off by train to London. The stupid girl had given no information to the family that any one had called and had been shown into the drawing-room, consequently the meeting never came about although designed by both parties.

"I was not a little disappointed at the moment; but have a thousand times since then thanked the Lord very heartily for the strange providence which forced my steps into another and far better path."

Mr. Spurgeon was too valuable a preacher to be left long in the retirement of Waterbeach. While there he distinguished himself in characteristic fashion. Being asked to preach the anniversary sermon at a neighbouring village, he presented himself to the pastor, who, astonished at his youth, spoke of "boys going up and down the country preaching before their mothers' milk was well out of their mouths"; but the young preacher promptly preached a sermon upon the text "The hoary head is a crown of glory" (Prov. xvi.), the character of which may be guessed from the fact that his aged colleague accosted him as "the sauciest dog that ever barked in a pulpit." This little village, however, was not the only place in which Spurgeon's voice was

heard, and an address delivered by him at Cambridge, in 1852 or 1853, brought him rapid preferment. One Mr. Gould, of Loughton, heard the young preacher; he carried the news of his power to Mr. Olney, a deacon of the New Park Street Chapel. Now the New Park Street Chapel was one of the most ancient Baptist institutions in London. It had been established two centuries before by Puritan Baptists; its pastorate had been held by William Rider; by Benjamin Keach, of "Metaphors" renown; by Benjamin Stinton; by John Gill, a noted commentator; by John Rippon, the editor of the Baptist hymn-book; by Joseph Angus, and James Smith. But New Park Street was in low water, and the deacons were on the look-out for a man capable of multiplying a congregation of 100 by 12, and so filling 1100 empty seats. Mr. Olney wrote to Mr. Spurgeon. The young preacher thought the invitation was wrongly addressed, and so answered. It was no mistake, but the beginning of Mr. Spurgeon's remarkable Metropolitan career. Very soon the young preacher was appointed permanent pastor, very soon 1200 seats had to be increased to 1800. Invitations to preach in various parts of the country came rapidly, and he did preach to overflowing congregations, under roofs and in the open air, with conspicuous success. While the New Park Street Chapel was being enlarged, Exeter Hall and the Surrey Music Hall, at which Lord Campbell is said to have attended, were pressed into service. The very large congregations which were attracted by Mr. Spurgeon's discourses were noticed in *The Times* of those days. In 1857 he preached to an assemblage of 24,000 people at the Crystal Palace, in connection with the Indian Mutiny. In 1859 the foundation stone of the Metropolitan Tabernacle was laid, a Bible, the Baptist Confession of Faith, the Declaration of the Deacons, and Dr. Rippon's hymn-book being placed underneath it. In 1861 the Metropolitan Tabernacle, capable of accommodating between five and six thousand persons, was opened free from debt. Since then various great institutions have grown up in connection with the Tabernacle, the principal being the Pastors' College, the Colportage Association, the Almshouses, the two orphanages at Stockwell, and the Mission-hall at Bermondsey—all brought into being and maintained by the energy of one man. In 1862 came a memorable controversy concerning baptismal regeneration. Three hundred thousand

copies of Mr. Spurgeon's sermons on the subject were circulated, and the controversy roused by them was so fierce that he dropped the prefix of reverend, and became, if possible, more of a free-lance preacher than before.

In politics Mr. Spurgeon exercised an active influence. A man of his oratorical strength, who was in the habit of addressing huge congregations, who did not shrink from alluding to the events of the day, could hardly fail to be a power; and the trenchant attack which he made upon Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy of 1886 was a serious blow to the influence of that sometime leader of the Liberal party. Of Spurgeon literature there is almost a library. *The Saint and his Saviour* came out in 1867; in 1868 *John Ploughman's Talk* was published, and obtained, before 1887, a circulation of three hundred and fifty thousand; 1872 brought to light the *Treasury of David* in seven volumes, and numerous religious works bear his name. A strong tribute is due also to the energy shown by Mr. Spurgeon in the education of young ministers, of which the Pastors' College is the visible sign.

It was as a writer and a preacher of sermons that Mr. Spurgeon exercised most powerful influence. An American author wrote of him that the chief sources of his power lay "in his wonderfully original, natural, and impressive delivery; his marvellous command of simple, precise, idiomatic, Saxon language, and his red-hot earnestness and singleness of purpose." There was justice in this rather superlative criticism, but for all that it did not describe Mr. Spurgeon's method adequately. Readers of his multitudinous sermons, which have been published regularly for nearly forty years, can hardly fail to be struck with them in many ways. They will notice in them a strong egotistical and anecdotal tendency, an outspoken defiance and confidence of tone, a fierce hatred of "the *Cloaca Maxima* of Rome," a detestation of anything and everything that is sham or artificial, a determination to be lively, an aptitude in the use of strong and familiar phrases. "There is raw material in a publican which you seldom find in a Pharisee. A Pharisee may polish up into an ordinary Christian; but somehow there is a charming touch about the pardoned sinner which is lacking in the other"—such is an example of his aptitude in familiar phrase taken from a "manifesto" of faith embodied in a sermon of 25th April 1890. The liveliness of the discourses is systematical

and deliberate ; witness the preface to the first volume of sermons published in 1856, in which the preacher says that "he is not quite sure about a smile being a sin, and, at any rate, he thinks it less crime to cause momentary laughter than a half-hour's slumber." On this principle he preached throughout a tolerably long life, with the result that he obtained hearers in thousands, when scholarly men could not obtain them by hundreds or even by scores; and had an almost unbounded influence over large bodies of men and women, chiefly in the lower middle classes. This eloquent and energetic preacher, who was almost worshipped by his immediate followers, whose views of things in daily life were abnormally shrewd, who was the personal friend of President Garfield and of Lord Shaftesbury, whose words were widely read, not only in Great Britain, but all the world over, who entertained, by the flashes of his shrewd wit, even those who were not attracted to his principles, will leave a great and visible gap in English life.

SIR JAMES CAIRD

1816–1892

OBITUARY NOTICE, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1892

SIR JAMES CAIRD was the son of Mr. James Caird, of Stranraer. He was born in 1816, and educated at the High School and University of Edinburgh. He early began the study of those agricultural and economic questions upon which he became such an eminent authority, and during the Protection controversy in 1849 he published a treatise on *High Farming as the Best Substitute for Protection*, which went rapidly through eight editions, and attracted much public attention. Mr. Caird was an ardent defender of Free Trade principles. In the autumn of 1849, at the request of Sir Robert Peel, he visited the west and south of Ireland, then prostrate from the effects of the famine, and at the desire of the Lord Lieutenant, the Earl of Clarendon, reported to the Government on the measures which he deemed requisite for encouraging the revival of agricultural enterprise in that country. This report was enlarged into a volume, published in 1850, descriptive of the agricultural resources of Ireland, and it led to considerable landed investments being made there.

In the beginning of 1850 the low prices of agricultural produce in England, and the serious complaints of farmers and landlords, indicated the necessity of some inquiry into the actual state of agriculture in the principal English counties. In order to ascertain the extent and true cause of the distress, this inquiry was originated by the *Times*, which appointed Mr. Caird as its commissioner. Sir Robert Peel wrote to Mr. Caird to the effect that nothing hitherto had been effectual in awakening the

landed proprietors to a sense of their own interests, and he therefore approved of a thorough and searching inquiry. In the first part of his investigations the *Times* Commissioner was associated with the late Mr. J. C. MacDonald, whose literary abilities contributed much to the success of the letters. The latter portion Mr. Caird conducted alone, and he also re-wrote the whole of the letters for publication. The letters afforded the only general account of the state of agriculture throughout England since Arthur Young's tours, made upwards of eighty years before. With the view of rendering the letters permanently useful, Mr. Caird was careful to note good examples of farming in the several counties, and to describe them in minute detail for the benefit of farmers generally. He also fully discussed the condition of the labourer and the relations between landlords and their tenants. The Commissioner noted the general absence of leases throughout England, and the immense mass of fertilising matter which continually ran to waste from all the large towns of the kingdom. The letters, after appearing in the columns of the *Times*, were published in a volume entitled *English Agriculture in 1850-51*. The work was subsequently translated into the French, German, and Swedish languages, and was also republished in the United States. In 1858 Mr. Caird published an account of a visit to the prairies of the Mississippi, descriptive of their fertility and great future. Translations of this work also appeared on the Continent, for as yet little European attention had been directed to the subject.

Mr. Caird's abilities as a statistician and an economist pointed him out as a suitable candidate for parliamentary honours. Accordingly, at the General Election of 1852 he was invited to offer himself to the electors of his native district, but he had the misfortune to be defeated by a majority of one only. However, at the General Election of 1857 he was elected member for the borough of Dartmouth as a supporter of Lord Palmerston, and an advocate of Liberal measures generally. He sat for Dartmouth until 1859, when he was elected for Stirling without opposition, and continued to sit for that constituency until 1865.

During the nine years Mr. Caird was in Parliament he took an active part in all subjects connected with agriculture and the condition of the people. In the session of 1859 he carried a

motion that the Scotch census should include inquiry into the housing of the people, thus bringing to light the significant characteristic of our civilisation, that two-thirds of the families lived in dwellings of one, or at most two rooms. In 1860 Mr. Caird was appointed a member of the Fishery Board, and in 1863 became chairman of the Royal Commission on the Sea Fisheries of the United Kingdom, Professor Huxley and Mr. Shaw Lefevre, M.P., being his colleagues. When the Civil War broke out in the United States, and great distress was caused in Lancashire by the failure of the American cotton supply, Mr. Caird drew the attention of the House of Commons to the whole subject. The debate took place in the session of 1863, and it turned principally upon the capabilities of India to supply the deficit of American importations, and the means by which the production from the former country might be encouraged and increased. Mr. Caird delivered an elaborate speech, in which he reviewed the policy of the Indian Government with regard to the cultivation of cotton, and adverted to the immense tracts adapted to its growth in our great Eastern dependency. He was supported by Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, and Sir Charles Wood, on behalf of the Government, admitted that it was to India we must look to obtain our great supply of cotton, but he deprecated putting Government pressure upon the natives, which would do more harm than good. During this same year (1863) Mr. Caird visited Algeria, Sicily, and Italy, to ascertain the possibility of extending the production of cotton in those countries in case the supplies from the Southern States of America should be still further seriously lessened by the war.

In the Session of 1864, after years of fruitless endeavour, Mr. Caird carried a resolution in favour of the collection of agricultural statistics, which was followed by a vote of £10,000 for that object. The returns of 1866 for Great Britain, the result of that vote, for the first time completed the agricultural statistics of the United Kingdom. Since that time the returns have been published annually, proving of unquestionable value. In 1865 Mr. Caird was appointed to the office of Inclosure Commissioner, and when the Land Commission for England was subsequently set on foot, he became senior member of the Commission. He revisited Ireland in 1869, and published a pamphlet on the Irish land question, soon after which he received the Companionship of the Bath. In 1868 and 1869

he published successive papers on the "Food of the People," read before the Statistical Society. In 1878, at the request of the President and Council of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, he prepared, for the French International Exhibition, an account of English agriculture, which was translated into French and German for the benefit of European agriculturists. It was afterwards separately published in this country under the title of *The Landed Interest.* In this work the author discussed the home and foreign supply of food; the changes and progress in agriculture of recent years; the soil, climate, and crops; the distribution of landed property; landowners, farmers, and labourers; land improvement; the recent rise in the value of land; the Government in its connection with agriculture; waste lands and copyholds; Church, Crown, and charity estates; and the future of agriculture. He estimated the tenant farmers' capital at upwards of 400 millions sterling.

Mr. Caird, who had devoted considerable attention to the economic conditions of India, was invited by Lord Salisbury, Secretary of State for India, to serve on the Famine Commission, appointed by Her Majesty's Government after the great famine in India of 1876-7 to inquire into the whole circumstances of that calamity. The object was to secure the adoption of such means as might enable timely provision to be made to meet the inevitable recurrence in that country of seasons of dearth. The inquiry embraced the whole of India, and its results were embodied in the Report of the Commission, which was laid before Parliament. In traversing the country with the members of the Commission—men eminent in their respective provinces, and two of them native gentlemen holding high office under native princes—an unusually favourable opportunity for observation of the land and the people was afforded, and of this Mr. Caird fully availed himself. He afterwards published a narrative of the examination of the country, under the title of *India; the Land and the People,* which had an extensive circulation. After exhaustive inquiry, Mr. Caird arrived at the general conclusion that the time had come when the prosperity of India under British rule could only be maintained by honestly carrying out the Queen's proclamation of 1858, "whereby it was promised that her subjects, of whatever race or creed, should be freely and impartially admitted to all offices in the service of India, the duties of which they might be

qualified by their education, ability, and integrity to discharge."

In 1882 Mr. Caird received the honour of knighthood, being created a K.C.B. In 1886 he was invited by Lord Salisbury to become a member of Earl Cowper's Commission to inquire into the agricultural state of Ireland, on which he served. Upon the formation of the new Board of Agriculture in 1889, Sir James Caird became a member of the Board, and was elevated to the rank of a Privy Councillor. In announcing his retirement from the Board at the end of 1891, we said in December last:—

"Sir James Caird will retire from the Board with a very honourable record. It was as a distinguished agriculturist, and one who had led in the march of improved agriculture, that Sir James Caird was appointed as a Land Commissioner. He retires from that post without having made a mistake, and with a splendid record, which is absolutely unsullied. It would be impossible to give higher praise than this, or to adduce further proof that very general regret will be felt that his splendid official career has come to its official end. All that can be said is that he will carry into his retirement the best wishes of every farmer and land-owner in the kingdom."

Although the vacancy on the Board caused by Sir James Caird's resignation was not filled up, some of the duties performed by him were taken over by Sir Jacob Wilson, who was appointed director of the land department of the Board of Agriculture.

In 1890, at the request of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, Sir James Caird prepared for their journal an account of the fifty years of valuable work of that society.

Sir James Caird was a Fellow of the Royal Society, a J.P. for Kirkcudbrightshire, and a D.L. and J.P. for Wigtownshire. He was twice married—first, to a daughter of Captain Henryson, R.E., and secondly, to Elizabeth, daughter of the late Mr. Robert Dudgeon. At his country seat of Cassencary, Kirkcudbrightshire, deceased was frequently visited by Mr. Bright, with whom he was on terms of intimate friendship.

VISCOUNT HAMPDEN

1814–1892

OBITUARY NOTICE, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1892

HENRY BOUVERIE WILLIAM BRAND was born in 1814, the second son of the 21st Baron Dacre, by the daughter of the Hon. Maurice Crosbie, Dean of Limerick. He represented Lewes in Parliament from 1852 to 1866, in which year he was returned for Cambridgeshire; and he sat for that county uninterruptedly until he quitted the House of Commons. From 1859 to 1866 he was Parliamentary secretary to the Treasury, and was for nine years associated with the late Mr. W. P. Adam as Whip of the Liberal party. In 1872, on the resignation of Mr. Denison, Mr. Brand was nominated Speaker of the House of Commons, Sir Roundell Palmer proposing, and Mr. Locke King seconding the motion for his election, which was carried unanimously. For twelve eventful years Mr. Brand occupied the Speaker's chair, from which he retired in 1884, on his elevation to the peerage as Viscount Hampden. He was rewarded, while he was still Speaker, with the Grand Cross of the Bath.

Great as were Mr. Brand's services to his party in the capacity of Whip, they were far excelled by those which he rendered as Speaker to the whole House, and, it is not too much to say, to the entire nation. His tenure of office was marked by scenes more turbulent than any that had occurred in the House of Commons since the time of Charles the First and Speaker Lenthall. During the years which saw the rise and growth of the Irish Parliamentary party, and the development of obstruction from a casual annoyance to a deliberate

and scientific system, he had every day to encounter difficulties such as had tried none of his predecessors.

It is true that he had the cordial support of all but a very small minority of the House ; yet to this minority, and indeed to every individual member who chose to exercise his extreme rights, the rules of procedure gave powers of almost unlimited obstruction. In no place in the world were the rights of the minority guarded more jealously than in the House of Commons. The state of things that existed before the procedure of the House was altered must be so fresh in the memory of the youngest Parliamentary hand that it will be enough to say that these rights of individual members, instead of being a valued possession of all, and a guarantee of liberty, became, calculated by misuse, a weariness, a nuisance, and an impediment to all business. Rules made by gentlemen for gentlemen, and notoriously resting on the general honour and good feeling of the House, were not perhaps broken, but were abused by a little knot of men who had carefully studied them in order to demonstrate their futility. A Speaker less just and less patient than Mr. Brand would have inflicted irremediable damage on the House of Commons. Mr. Brand, however, never for a moment lost his patience, his temper, his clear-headedness, or his courtesy ; and those who had formerly doubted the expediency of appointing a party Whip to the chair, perceived at once that he had every qualification for the office.

Obstruction was not previously unknown in the House, but obstruction in its crudest and most barefaced form was first practised in the Session of 1877, when less than half-a-dozen Home Rule members, of whom Mr. Parnell was the leading spirit, proved that it was to paralyse all business by moving alternately the adjournment of the House and of the debate. On each of these motions every one of this group of members habitually spoke, and spoke at length ; and when all had exhausted their rights of speaking, a division was taken, and the motion was instantly renewed. These members were admittedly within the letter of their rights, and were so led by Mr. Parnell that no formal exception could ever be taken to their proceedings. But their design was obvious and unconcealed, and it became necessary once more to prove that "none have gone about to break Parliaments, but in the end Parliament has broken them." The question was how to break

them, how to restore to the House as a body the management of its own business and its own time. Night after night the debates—if such performances can be called debates—became a mere trial of physical endurance, and the House on more than one fine summer's morning presented the scene, not of members who had "sat up all night like gentlemen, and supped at Bellamy's afterwards," but of a weary and dissipated assembly of men, still in evening dress, who should have been in bed, or at breakfast, or in Rotten Row. On 2nd July 1877 the House met as usual at four o'clock. Supply was obstructed by seven members ; 17 divisions were taken, and the House was counted out at a quarter past seven o'clock on the following morning. On the 31st of July in the same year the South Africa Bill was in Committee, and the sitting was prolonged till six o'clock in the afternoon of the next day—a Wednesday. Twenty-one divisions were taken, in 18 of which not more than five members constituted the minority. In 1878 there were all-night sittings on 1st April (fourteen hours) and 13th May (seventeen hours and a half). On 26th August 1880 the House was in Supply on Irish votes, and the sitting lasted for twenty-one hours. These are but a few of the earlier all-night sittings, and we have not attempted to enumerate the many occasions when, thanks to the same cause, we have ended our report with the statement that the House was still sitting when we went to press.

It was in the year 1881 that the decisive action was taken by Mr. Brand that will always render his occupation of the chair memorable. On 24th January Mr. Forster moved for leave to bring in his Bill for the Protection of Person and Property in Ireland. The debate was adjourned till the next day, when Mr. Gladstone moved that the Bill, and its companion the Arms Bill, be proceeded with *de die in diem*. The motion was fiercely opposed and obstructed by a minority that numbered thirty-three, when a division was taken after a sitting of twenty-two hours. On 31st January the debate was resumed on the motion for leave to bring in Mr. Forster's Bill, Mr. Gladstone announcing early in the evening that he expected to take the first reading of the Bill at that sitting. The Home Rulers openly stated that every form of the House would be used to defeat this intention, and preparations were made for the struggle. The majority was kept together by relays of Liberal and Conservative members, Mr. Gladstone being supported by

the Opposition, as well as by his own party, and the Speaker and Deputy-Speaker occupied the chair in turns. The Home Rulers were now numerous enough to adopt the system of relays, and a prospect was thus opened of an indefinitely long sitting. The House, in fact, sat continuously all Monday night, all day on Tuesday, all Tuesday night, till nine o'clock on Wednesday morning. Then, after more than forty-one hours, came the crisis and the end.

At nine o'clock on Wednesday morning, the indefatigable Mr. Biggar was speaking when the Speaker, who had retired at 11.30 on Tuesday night, resumed the chair. In a few grave words Mr. Brand declared that the motion was being resisted by an inconsiderable minority, and by obstruction which had been recognised as a Parliamentary offence. The dignity, credit, and authority of the House were threatened, and it was necessary they should be vindicated. He was satisfied that he should best carry out the will of the House if, by the inherent authority of the chair, he declined to call on any more members to speak, and proceeded to put the several questions. He then put the motion that leave be given to bring in the Bill, and on a division the motion was carried by one hundred and sixty-four to nineteen, and the Bill was read a first time, the Irish members leaving the House in a body. Shortly afterwards the regulation as regards "urgency" was adopted by the House, and more stringent rules of procedure were framed, in all of which Mr. Brand's long Parliamentary experience was of the greatest service. The critical moment was now passed, and the Speaker, taking, as he himself said, a new and exceptional course, had by his own courage rescued the House from a position of great danger and discredit. It must be left to constitutional purists to dispute the legality of his action. It may be true that a Speaker has eyes and ears only as the House directs; but common sense, that supreme quality which Mr. Brand did not hesitate to exercise, must condone any irregularity that there may have been in his method of cutting the Gordian knot.

Mr. Brand was a popular as well as a strong Speaker, and the general esteem in which he was held by all parties in the House, even the obstructives recognising his impartiality, was gracefully and effectively shown on the occasion of his farewell in 1884. Since that time he has largely retired from politics, though he took the Gladstonian side in the division of the

Liberal party, and devoted himself mainly to the pursuits of a country gentleman. He was Lord Lieutenant of Sussex, and at Glynde, his place near Lewes, he had a large dairy farm, and brought the art of dairying to great perfection. He married, in 1838, Eliza, daughter of General Robert Ellice, and is succeeded, both in the viscountcy and in the ancient barony of Dacre (to which he succeeded on his brother's death without issue in 1890), by his son, Mr. Henry Robert Brand, who was born in 1841, and sat for a few years in the House of Commons, where, with Mr. Caine, he was a teller in the memorable division against Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill. His third son, Mr Arthur Brand, is the Gladstonian nember for Wisbech.

PROFESSOR E. A. FREEMAN

1823–1892

OBITUARY NOTICE, THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1892

THE news of the death of Mr. Edward Augustus Freeman, D.C.L., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, will be received with great and general regret, not only in the University, but wherever English history is studied. Since Dr. Stubbs became a bishop, and was thus taken away from a learned to a busy administrative life, his friend Mr. Freeman has stood unquestionably at the head of English historical scholarship. For five-and-thirty years he had been at once the most prolific of our historians, and the most energetic and constant advocate of a truer view of history than used to prevail. For eight years he was Regius Professor, but his real work in life may almost be said to have been accomplished before he obtained that position. It was by his *History of the Norman Conquest* and his very numerous other volumes, by his multitudinous prefaces, papers, and reviews, and by his literally innumerable articles in the *Saturday Review* and other papers, that Mr. Freeman had impressed upon his generation his views of how history should be studied and what were many of its positive lessons. We do not say that he has not been very useful as Regius Professor; but he was over sixty years old when he was appointed, he had lived for years in literary solitude in the country, and he was therefore somewhat out of touch with Oxford, and was too old to adapt himself very readily to the views of the place. It is not by his professorial but by his literary work that he will be judged; and from that point of view it is certain that he has established

a real claim upon the gratitude and the consideration of his fellow-countrymen.

He was the son of the late Mr. John Freeman, of Pedmore Hall, Worcestershire, and was born at Harborne, in Staffordshire, in 1823. Thus at the time of death he was approaching his 70th year. In 1841 he was elected scholar of Trinity College, Oxford, of which foundation he remained (even after his election to a Fellowship of Oriel in 1884) a loyal and devoted son. He read hard as an undergraduate, but, like Matthew Arnold six months before, he missed his first class. He obtained a second; in the first were Thomas Arnold, James Riddell, and Goldwin Smith. Freeman was deeply affected by the "Oxford Movement," of which those were the critical years, and to the end of his life he retained his sympathy with the aims, aspirations, and interests of the Tractarians. Their return to mediævalism fitted in with his own historical tastes; and it was significant that his first published volume, which appeared in 1849, was a *History of Architecture*, in which the Gothic obtained something more than its share of admiration. There followed such publications as an *Essay on Window Tracery* (1850) and *The Architecture of Llandaff Cathedral* (1851), and, a few years later, a work on St. David's, written conjointly with Dr. Basil Jones, the present Bishop of the See. His *History and Conquests of the Saracens* (1856) took him farther afield; and meantime he had begun that course of regular writing on historical subjects in periodicals which may almost be said to have constituted his chief work, and the most influential part of his work, for thirty years. From the time of the foundation of the *Saturday Review* until the days when the Eastern Question came once more to divide parties in England by so deep a cleavage, Freeman wrote regularly his one, two, or three articles a week in that paper; generally a review of a book and an article on the history of some town, or on a point of historico-political or historico-artistic interest. A number of these articles have since been collected and published with his name in one or other of his volumes of essays. Their merits are familiar to every one. They contain, in the first place, first-hand information; in the second, they bear in every paragraph their certificate of origin in a mind stored with varied knowledge and well trained in the comparative method. In the books about towns and

places, especially, Freeman's qualities appear at their best; you feel in reading even a summary sketch of Lucca or Aachen that you are in the presence of a man who has been over every inch of the ground, and over every incident in the chronicles. But these short articles, though they contain what in the opinion of many is his best work, are not all that a list of his immense mass of writings has to show. When in search of a *magnum opus*, for some years he wavered between a theme that should take him over centuries of time and vast regions of space, and another that should be small in actual volume, but pregnant in results for England. At first he inclined to the former, and produced the first volume of a great *History of Federal Government*—a first volume that had no successor (1863). It dealt with later Greek history, especially with that of the Achaian League, and was intended to be followed by volumes on Switzerland, North America, etc. But soon, though he continued to hanker after this subject all his life, Freeman abandoned it as too gigantic for proper treatment; and for many years he flung himself into a subject of the other sort—a short but immensely important moment in English history. *The History of the Norman Conquest* began to appear in 1867: the fifth and last volume was published in 1876. The scale of the book is very large; the writer began with a long and comprehensive account of earlier English history, and in the later volumes he went into the most elaborate detail as to every single known incident of William's life, the campaign, and the settlement of the country. A writer's chief work must decide the position that posterity is to assign to him; and Freeman will be judged, not by his essays and articles, but by *The Norman Conquest* and its sequel, his *History of William Rufus*. They form substantially one book; is it a great book? Hardly; for with immense power of accumulation, much acuteness in testing and estimating evidence, and no little picturesqueness of style, Freeman had not the gift of selection, and his sense of proportion was extraordinarily faulty. The great and unnecessary length of the book will prevent its ever being generally read; but, though Freeman may have been conscious of this artistic and practical mistake, he never showed the least intention of amending it. Only last summer he brought out the first two volumes of his long-promised *History of Sicily*, an interesting country, to tracing the career of which, through

Sikelian, Greek, Carthaginian, Roman, Arab, Norman, and later times, a master might lawfully devote a thousand pages. But in Freeman's hands the thousand pages, or thereabouts, were exhausted before we had even come in sight of the Roman conquest. Again, with him the relative magnitudes of persons, of places, and of events undergo the most curious transformations. The concluding chapters of the *Norman Conquest* contain an eloquent attempt to demonstrate, not only that William the Conqueror was a very great man—which everybody admits—but that he was quite as great a man as Cæsar, or Napoleon, or any other of the world-heroes of the past. And Freeman's last published utterance, a paper in one of the magazines, opens with a similar paradox—the statement that the country in Europe which is at this moment politically the most interesting is . . . Finland!

We abstain from giving a full list of Freeman's published volumes; but it may be said that those which we have mentioned, with the various series of Historical Essays and with a book on *The Historical Geography of Europe*, are the chief. When every deduction has been made, these books form a very real title to fame, and a whole generation of students, formed in the school of accurate and comprehensive research which he did so much to found, will regard his name with a feeling akin to reverence. At least two very eminent writers, Mr. Bryce and the late John Richard Green, may in some sense be classed as his pupils; and, as we have said, the present Bishop of Oxford was his close friend and fellow-worker. But it must not be forgotten that Mr. Freeman was something else than an historian. "History is past politics; politics is present history," he once wrote—which implied that he also was a politician. In 1868 he stood as Liberal candidate for Mid Somerset, but was easily beaten by his Conservative opponent. In 1876 he came out very strongly as an advocate, first of the Servian and Bulgarian, and then of the Russian cause, and his denunciations of "the Turk" were many and loud. A number of his letters on those and other political questions appeared, then and later, in our columns. It was he who, in a speech delivered at the meeting in St. James's Hall in the midst of the Eastern crisis, uttered the celebrated phrase which was afterwards popularly corrupted into "Perish India!" The words used were really "Perish

our Indian Empire, rather than that wrong should be done!" When Mr. Gladstone went over to Home Rule, Mr. Freeman welcomed the move, and, as was not unnatural in one who has always believed in federation as the cure for all political ills, he became a strong Home Ruler. Sometimes, however, his utterances were not quite in accord with the official view, as when, in a speech delivered not very long ago at Wells, he expressed himself very strongly in favour of the exclusion of the Irish members from the Imperial Parliament, and said that such an exclusion was not only logical, but the one prospect that made him enthusiastic for the cause. Another question of the day in which Mr. Freeman actively took sides was the vivisection question, in connection with which he played a leading part in the two attempts made a few years ago to overthrow Dr. Burdon Sanderson, the present very eminent Professor of Biology at Oxford. Mr. Freeman married soon after taking his degree, and had a family of sons and daughters; one of the latter is married to Mr. Arthur J. Evans, the well-known archæologist and traveller, and now the keeper of the Ashmolean Museum. Mr. Freeman was made an Hon. D.C.L. of Oxford, at Lord Salisbury's installation, 1870, Hon. LL.D. of Cambridge 1874, and of Edinburgh 1884. He was also a Knight of various Greek, Servian, and Montenegrin Orders, and a corresponding member of a large number of foreign academies and learned societies.

WALT WHITMAN

1819–1892

Obituary Notice, Monday, March 28, 1892

Walt Whitman had a chequered and remarkable career, and by the native strength of his genius came to occupy the position of one of the most prominent of American poets. He was recognised as the laureate of the democracy of the United States. While his works are disfigured by many crudities and eccentricities, and even grossnesses of style, they are all impressed with the stamp of a vigorous originality. The poet was the son of Walter and Louisa Whitman, and was born at West Hills, in the township of Huntington, Long Island, New York State, on the 31st of May 1819. The elder Whitman was the descendant of an English family, that settled at Huntington as far back as 1660, and his wife came of a Dutch family named Van Velsor, which had for generations been resident in Long Island. The singer of the future was christened Walter, but he was universally known by the abbreviation which has now become so familiar. He attended the public schools of Brooklyn until he was thirteen years old, and then had brief but varied experiences, first in a lawyer's office, next in a doctor's establishment, and subsequently in a printing-house, where for two years he set up types. In 1836 he became a teacher in country schools, and devoted his leisure to writing for the magazines and newspapers. In 1839-40 he published a weekly newspaper at Huntington called the *Long Islander*, and for the succeeding twelve years he continued to blend the occupations of author and compositor. From 1840 to 1845 he pursued his literary work in New York city during the winter,

but spent the summers in the country, doing some farm work. Of a much more rugged nature than the gentle naturalist Thoreau, he had yet many tastes in common with him. After editing the Brooklyn *Eagle* for two years, Whitman went on an expedition with his brother Jefferson through all the middle States, their route being down the Ohio and Mississippi, and back by the Mississippi and Missouri, Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Erie, Niagara Falls and Lower Canada, and then by way of Central New York and the Hudson. In the year 1850 he published the *Freeman* newspaper in Brooklyn.

At this time, as we learn from Dr. Maurice Bucke's interesting monograph, Whitman took up carpentering, and began to build houses in Brooklyn. The occupation became profitable, but too absorbing, and Whitman surrendered it in 1854 in favour of the mission for which he had long been educating himself—that of "preaching the gospel of the democracy and of the natural man." He might be described as the apostle of the unsophisticated. He hated and despised the veneer of modern society, and advocated a return to the original simplicity of character in man, with a love of nature and the external universe. Proceeding to give embodiment to his ideas, he published in 1855 a number of compositions under the title of *Leaves of Grass*. They were startlingly novel and unique, and were in part printed by Whitman himself, but they failed to take root, save with a few intellectual men, who perceived in the author a very decided although a very peculiar gift. For example, Emerson wrote to Whitman: "I am not blind to the worth of the wonderful gift of the *Leaves of Grass*. I find it the most extraordinary piece of wit and wisdom America has yet contributed. I am very happy in reading it, as great power makes us happy. It meets the demand I am always making of what seemed the sterile and stingy nature, as if too much handiwork, or too much lymph in the temperament, were making our Western wits fat and mean. I give you joy of your free and brave thought. I have great joy in it. I find incomparable things said incomparably well, as they must be. I find the courage of treatment which so delights us, and which large perception only can inspire. I greet you at the beginning of a great career." The poet was not discouraged by the generally cold reception which his work met with, but in 1856 published an extended edition of the *Leaves*, containing

thirty-two pieces. Still he was neglected, and in 1860 a sumptuous edition of *Leaves of Grass* appeared at Boston, with a number of new poems called "Enfans d'Adam," which drew forth much hostile criticism. In 1862, soon after the Civil War broke out, Whitman left New York and Brooklyn, and went to the seat of war, wintering partly with the army of the Potomac. He ministered with noble devotion to the wounded, and in 1864 was struck down by his first illness, hospital malaria. On his recovery he secured a clerkship in the Department of the Interior at Washington, but was dismissed by Secretary Harlan for his authorship of the *Leaves of Grass*. At this time he still continued his hospital work, and composed his "President Lincoln's Funeral Hymn." Another clerkship was given him in the office of the Attorney-General. His *Drum-Taps*, poems connected with the war, appeared in 1865, to which were subsequently added his fine poem on the death of Lincoln, and other effusions. He lectured at sundry times upon President Lincoln, and wrote at intervals for magazines and newspapers. A new edition of *Leaves of Grass* appeared in 1866, together with a special series of poems called *Songs before Parting*. A further edition appeared at Washington in 1870, with a new and separate volume of poems entitled, *Passage to India*, and a prose work, *Democratic Vistas*. Whitman declaimed at the American Institute in 1871 a new poem, "After all, not to Create only," and in the succeeding year, at the Commencement, Dartmouth College, he gave another new poem, "As a Strong Bird on Pinions Free." Serious trouble fell upon the poet in 1873, when he was attacked by paralysis, and lost his mother by death. He now gave up all official work, and retired to Camden, New Jersey, where his brother, Colonel Whitman, resided. He suffered much from ill-health from this time forward, but in 1875 wrote a new prose work, *Memoranda during the War*. He also reprinted *Leaves of Grass*, and prepared a companion volume of prose and verse, with the title of *Two Rivulets*.

Partially recovering his health, Whitman travelled in 1879 through Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, etc., and spent the summer of the ensuing year in Canada. In 1881 Messrs. Osgood of Boston issued a new edition of *Leaves of Grass*, but suppressed it under threats of prosecution. Whitman took the plates, and issued from Camden, in 1882, "the author's edition." The

various issues of the *Leaves* are much sought after by collectors. An edition, carefully revised by the poet, appeared at Philadelphia in 1883, together with an autobiographical volume entitled *Specimen Days and Collect.* The latter was chiefly constructed of Whitman's prose writings, old and new. He subsequently published *November Boughs;* and at intervals leisurely and exploringly travelled to the Prairie States, the Rocky Mountains, Canada, New York, Long Island, and Boston. At length he took up his abode in a little old cottage and lot in Mickle Street, Camden, with a housekeeper and man-nurse. He was completely disabled from paralysis, but still continued to write for publication. Strange to say, although he was the singer of the new democracy, his books were less received and read in America than in the British Islands and on the European Continent. In 1888 Whitman added to the *Leaves* "Sands at Seventy" and other poems. The English admirers of Whitman presented him with a testimonial in the shape of a purse of gold in 1887; and in 1889 he received congratulations from men of letters in all parts of the world on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. Whitman wrote a characteristic "Ode to the New Republic of Brazil" in January 1890.

The genius of this writer was early recognised in England by Lord Tennyson, Thomas Carlyle, and others. He was acknowledged to be something more than a mere voice. His uncouth style; his contempt for rhyme, metre, and even in many cases rhythm; and a freedom of language which is frequently unpardonable, will militate against Whitman's acceptance by the general public. But he had an intense earnestness of conviction, and was undoubtedly a man of great freshness of thought and fecundity of ideas. His philosophy was strongly optimistic, and whatever defects his poems may reveal, they at least testify that their author was a man of power, fertility, and resource; and he cannot but exercise considerable effect upon the future of American literature.

LORD BRAMWELL

1808–1892

OBITUARY NOTICE, TUESDAY, MAY 10, 1892

IN Lord Bramwell one of the most original figures of our time, among the best known of Englishmen—one, indeed, whom all knew by name and to whom many were deeply attached—has disappeared. There have been and will be even greater lawyers than he was; English law has never had, and perhaps never again will have, a representative cast in his unique mould.

Lord Bramwell was the eldest son of a London banker, the late Mr. George Bramwell, and was born in 1808. He was educated at a private school, and early entered his father's bank, where he acquired that intimate knowledge of business habits and forms which stood him in good stead in later years. He read in the chambers of Fitzroy Kelly, then a junior in large practice, and with a reputation second to none as a master of the Common Law. Among his fellow-pupils were several—for the most part long gone—who were to be his colleagues and companions at the Bar and on the Bench. For some time Bramwell practised with considerable success as a special pleader, and in 1838 he was called to the Bar. He did not get at once, or even very rapidly, a large practice—a fact which he often mentioned in his kindly way to disconsolate, despairing juniors. Success came a little tardily and gradually. "One day I was sitting in my chambers when there came a shagbag attorney with a brief for Maidstone, Platt to lead me. In the course of the case the Judge or the other side raised an objection; Platt answered the point, indifferently, and the Judge thought so. I whispered something to Platt, and found myself on my legs, giving my answer.

'Oh, that is quite a different matter, Mr. Platt,' said the Judge, satisfied and convinced; and I sat down, having made a very good impression. I thought briefs would be showered upon me, but they were not; that attorneys would be at my chambers when I returned, but they were not. Still, from that time, somehow, I never looked back."

Bramwell joined the Home Circuit at a time when much business of a substantial character was taken to it, and when it boasted a very able Bar. Probably Thesiger and Platt had the pick of the cases. But there were other leaders of repute, and there was a crowd of excellent juniors forcing their way to the front. Lush, Shee, Honyman, and Bovill; and Ballantine, Parry, and Hawkins were soon to make themselves known in civil as well as criminal cases. It would be wrong to speak of Lord Bramwell as supremely successful when at the Bar. His worth was first fully admitted when he became a Judge. He was never an eloquent advocate; indeed, he had not much liking or respect for so-called eloquence, and he was too much alive to the defects of his own case to be always persuasive. Arnould, the poet laureate of the circuit, described him in those days in lines well known on the Home Circuit—

> And Bramwell, blushing with a maiden grace,
> Strives to look honest in a jury's face;
> While stubborn juries, proof against his wiles,
> Decide for Nokes, while he appears for Styles.

This rough circuit wit was not quite just to the effects of Mr. Bramwell's advocacy. But these lines hint, truly enough, that with an inferior tribunal he was sometimes less successful than counsel who stooped to acts of which his altogether candid nature was incapable. With a special jury, and in commercial cases, he was much more at home; he was still better in an argument at *banc*, and such reports as "Meeson and Welsby," "Hurlston and Norman," record many admirable arguments by him. He was at his best whenever complete legal knowledge and robust good sense were needed. "We always used to notice he became uneasy when a real point of law turned up," he himself once said of the late Lord Denman. It was just the opposite with Bramwell; then he put out his full strength.

A master of the art of special pleading, fit to bandy subtleties with Littledale or Parke, he was never an admirer of the

technicalities, offensive to good sense, which prevailed when he was at the Bar; and when a Commission was appointed, in 1849, to inquire into the procedure of the Courts of Common Law, Mr. Bramwell was naturally appointed a member of it. Many of the best suggestions of that most useful Commission were due to him. To him and the late Mr. Justice Willes, then also a stuff-gownsman, fell the honour of framing the first Common Law Procedure Acts. In 1851 Mr. Bramwell was made a Q.C. His practice, though never of the very largest, was chiefly in important cases. His reputation as a lawyer and as a man of robust sense was growing; and his appointment, in 1856, as a Baron of the Exchequer was universally popular. Most of us have forgotten that each of the three Courts at Westminster, with civil jurisdiction in most respects nominally equal, had a character of its own. Suitors might resort to any of them; but for ages they had preferred the Court of Queen's Bench, the Court of Common Pleas coming next, the Court of Exchequer coming last. Things somewhat changed, and the presence of Baron Bramwell did much to bring it about. Whether he was best as a member of the Court *in Banc*, or sitting at *Nisi Prius*, or presiding in a Criminal Court, the profession was not agreed. If we may hazard an opinion, he was seen to most advantage in trying a case of importance with the aid of a special jury. The force of common sense could no further go than in his pregnant summings-up. Evil-doers dreaded him; for to the brutal, the cowardly, the rowdy, the professional ruffians of every sort, he was not over-merciful. But no innocent prisoner had reason to lament being tried by the strong-minded, sagacious Baron. No one was more patient in helping out a dull witness, half scared by the novelty of his circumstances. One of the first criminal cases of importance which it fell to him to try was the charge of murder brought against William Dove. In those days people were not so familiar as they are now with theories of moral insanity; certain fallacies on the subject were then much more plausible than they now seem. Two well-known doctors, Dr. Pyeman Smith and Dr. Williams, deposed to the prisoner being morally insane; but the Judge kept the jury to the legal issue whether the prisoner knew that he was doing wrong, and the result was a conviction, perfectly just, followed by execution.

Baron Bramwell did not always, especially in his early days

on the Bench, respect conventional traditions, and his plain directness of speech sometimes shocked sensitive people. There was a hubbub when he did not, upon one occasion, insist upon a witness taking off his glove while the oath was being administered. Still greater was the outcry when, on another occasion, in pronouncing sentence of death upon one Richard Reeve, he merely said, "My duty is to pass upon you the sentence of death for that offence, and that is my only duty." His sayings were misquoted and often perverted. What was uttered half-humorously was foolishly attributed to feelings wholly alien to him. When he advised in court a husband who complained of a termagant wife to "chain her up," or in a general assembly proposed that the State should prosecute all round everybody who attacked anybody's religious belief, only the dullest understood him literally. He had an antipathy to all the unctuous platitudes of the Bench ; and the following dialogue seems to show that he sympathised with the dislike of criminals to have a course of high-pitched moral reflections in addition to the statutory sentence :—

Baron Bramwell (to prisoner found guilty).—You have been convicted.

Prisoner.—'Ow much ?

Baron Bramwell.—Nine months. (Exit prisoner.)

After having sat in the Exchequer longer than any member of it, after having seen almost all his colleagues disappear, he was, in 1876, appointed a Lord Justice of Appeal. Whether he was equally successful in his new position we will not undertake to say. But he was a valuable and invariably strong member of the Court ; his knowledge of the Common Law was unmatched ; and he never failed to temper it with that best of all kinds of equity—the manly good sense which gives to technical rules their just limitations. In 1881 he retired from the Bench. He was still vigorous, versatile, and ingenious ; but his health had failed a little, and he had been obliged to winter abroad. He had held office longer than any judge of his generation, not excepting Baron Parke. Raised to the Bench long before judges much older than he—long before Sir Fitzroy Kelly, for example, with whom he had read—he was an interesting link between the present and the past. He had been called to the Bar a little after Lord Tenterden made, reluctantly and apologetically, a few changes in the supposed

perfection of the Common Law. He had helped to frame and to work the Common Law Procedure Acts. He had given valuable aid in shaping the Judicature Acts, and, unlike some of his colleagues, he showed no desire to thwart or lessen the effect of the changes. He had aided in introducing the principle of limited liability—indeed, by the way, he was proud of having devised the term "limited." "Mention it in my life," he once jocularly observed to the present writer. The Bar decided to pay to the oldest and most popular of judges a unique mark of respect. Those who were present at the dinner given to him in the Inner Temple Hall, attended by almost every practising barrister, by judges and high officials, will never forget the scene. It was the affectionate, regretful parting of true friends; the Bar knew that it lost a judge who had no enemies; he did not conceal the fact that he tore himself with difficulty from old scenes, or that he still delighted in the strife. But he did not pass into retirement. In 1882 he was raised to the peerage as Baron Bramwell of Hever. His help in the House of Lords was needed. Lord Blackburn had acquired an influence, it might almost be said a supremacy, in regard to Common Law questions, which had its disadvantages. Lord Bramwell was an excellent addition to the final Court of Appeal. He was inclined to dissent, perhaps, a little too often. But his dissenting judgments were vigorous and instructive, expressed in his forcible, direct, homely way. In the *Bank of England* v. *Vagliano*, which gave rise to so much difference of opinion as to the construction of the Bills of Exchange Act, Lord Bramwell and Lord Field held that the Bank of England was not liable. We all recollect his criticism of the doctrine, countenanced by some judges, that Petridi and Co., the alleged drawers, were a sham and yet somehow existed. "This beats me. They are at the same time real and unreal; they are that which is said to be an impossibility—being and not being at the same time." And here occurs to us the characteristic way in which he expressed his dissent in another case: "Lord Cairns was a great lawyer and a consummate judge, but I differ from him unhesitatingly." In the Lovat peerage claim one of his comments on the claimant's case was that the person through whom he claimed "must have been working at manual labour manifestly from the time when he was at least 112 years old, and eloped at 75 with a young woman, and had a child at 95";

and it was characteristic of Lord Bramwell, an economist well acquainted with the history of the currency, that he pointed out that the claimant stated that he had paid thirty guineas for a horse in Inverness at a time when no gold coins circulated in Scotland.

Of most judges all is told when their history at the Bar and on the Bench is narrated. Not so with Lord Bramwell; though he has left a mark upon English law, a full half of his intellectual life was outside it. He followed political and social events with the keenest interest, and of political economy he was an enthusiastic student. He was elected a member of the Political Economy Club in March 1855, in succession to Mr. E. P. Bouverie, and until lately there was no more regular attendant at the dinners of the club, and no more frequent sharer in the discussions. The first discussion which he opened at the club was, "Is there any sufficient foundation for the provision that all contracts involving the value of more than ten pounds shall be in writing?" Another was, "How should the liability of employers to workmen in consequence of accidents arising from the negligence of fellow-workmen be regulated according to economic principles?" Though rarely opener of the discussions, he took a part second to none in the debates. Members of the club will never forget the old man, wise, keen, vigilant, and ever attentive when anything to the purpose was heard, and swiftly interposing with some pertinent, incisive question, often more instructive than any speech. To the youngest member — to the young especially—he was attentive; nothing irritated him except arrogance and flatulent verbiage. Of one member, long passed away, who was fond of indulging in tirades against the House of Lords as composed of idlers, etc., he quietly observed: "If what he says of us be true, I am not fit to be a member here; and if it isn't, he is not fit." Lord Bramwell did not delight in some of the modern developments of economic science. He thought some modern speculations on the subject profitless and wire-drawn. "I have in my mind a book, very clever and very deep, which I cannot read. It is very subtle, but not practical, and after a few pages I get bewildered." In the applications of the science to currency questions he was most at home. In the address which he delivered in 1888, as President of Section E of the British Association, he remarked that he had spent "nearly two-thirds of a century in trying to

learn something about it." He would not allow that political economy was a dull subject. It "has been called a dismal science; I never could read ten pages of him who so called it." His position in regard to economics was simple and clear. He had an utter disbelief in the benefit of State interference, *Laisser faire, laisser aller*, was in his view the highest wisdom; and he wrote, in answer to a speech by his friend Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, a brilliant pamphlet, entitled, "Laissez faire," in which occurred such sentences as these: "Suppose my friend and I had to think for each other's wants instead of each for his own, I am afraid I should feed him sometimes when he was not hungry, and he occasionally would put me to bed when I was not sleepy. I should take him, for his good, to the Liberty and Property Defence League, and he would take me, for mine, to a Social Science Congress, to the edification of neither." And yet he was not so insensible to the evils and misery existing under the present constitution of society as was apt to be supposed. "Every good man has been at some time of his life a socialist," he often said; never failing to add, "And, if wise, very soon ceased to be one." In regard to ethics, he was of the school of Bentham and the elder Mill, and he expressed his convictions in his vigorous way: "Natural rights are talked of. Nonsense! Natural rights may exist when men are in a state of nature—what they may be I know not; but when man is in a social state, his rights are what the law gives him; and if the law is wise it will give him all he can get."

Lord Bramwell knew the legal system administered before the Common Law Procedure Acts. He knew also its defects. He had been a contemporary of Baron Parke, the greatest master of relentless legal logic, but he was never blind to the defects of the system. Only lately, in speaking of the preposterous mode of enforcing judgments before the Judicature Acts, he observed: "I think that some twenty or thirty years hence, when the present generation of lawyers has ceased to exist, it will scarcely be believed that such a state of things did exist in a civilised country." For authorities, no matter how venerable, if irrational or founded on no principle, he had little respect. If they were too firmly rooted to be explained away, he was ready to give his powerful aid in removing them by legislation. "I am prone to decide cases on principle," he once wrote, "and when I think I have got the right one, I am apt (I hope I am not presump-

tuous), like Caliph Omar, to think authorities wrong or needless." We will add that he had constantly present to his mind that which is so apt to slip out of the sight of lawyers—the ends for which laws and courts exist. A great judge himself, he once said: "I declare that if I had the choice to be a great Judge or a good Judge, I should much prefer to be the latter." He initiated not a few measures of legal reform, and gave his aid to many more. Thus, to prevent the scandal of prisoners being detained for long periods waiting their trial for burglary, he proposed to widen the jurisdiction of justices. Writing to a friend of his Bill for this purpose, he remarks: "To say that justices cannot try these cases is absurd. It is to say they cannot try what o'clock it was when the thing was done, for on that depends whether it is burglary or only house-breaking." He introduced into the House of Lords a useful Bill consolidating the entire law as to arbitration.

No man appeared to think less of words and more of substance than Lord Bramwell, yet few of his contemporaries were greater masters of style than he. Not Cobbett or Bright used his mother tongue with more effect. For the vague, namby-pamby, the stilted, the rolling, rotund style of oratory he had an antipathy. A sort of happy, classical colloquialism was his natural style. How often in our columns, under the familiar signature "B.," has the right word been said—something felicitous, apt, and portable as a proverb, bright and glittering as an epigram, good sense in its best attire! How often in the future shall we miss his thrusts into the very vitals of imposture. Of the style of his judgments, no praise can be too high. They are welcome to every student of reports—true oases in arid deserts. Often they are, unconsciously and without a thought about effect, true literary masterpieces. There have been, we repeat, greater lawyers than Lord Bramwell. None could be more missed than he. A personality as vigorous and original as Thurlow's or Maule's, one who was as well known in society as Lyndhurst, he who stood so many years four square to all the winds that blew, has passed away, and every Englishman who knew him well will regret him as one of the sturdiest, manliest, and kindliest of his generation. A monument to him will be somewhere erected. All barristers will subscribe to do honour to one who was their common friend. Whether the sculpture will show him genial, sagacious, alert, with upraised finger

putting to counsel before him his favourite dilemma, we do not know. But the aptest inscription would be the words which we have quoted: "I declare that if I had the choice to be a great Judge or a good Judge, I should much prefer to be the latter," with one addition, that it was his rare fortune to be both.

THOMAS COOPER

1805–1892

Obituary Notice, Saturday, July 16, 1892

Mr. Thomas Cooper, the well-known Chartist leader and Christian lecturer, died at Lincoln yesterday afternoon, in the eighty-eighth year of his age. On Thursday he was seized with a slight attack of illness, which in his enfeebled state left him entirely prostrate, and he passed peacefully away. The career of this well-known Chartist leader, and religious and political controversialist, furnishes another example of the triumphs which may be achieved by indomitable resolution and perseverance in the humblest spheres. By his father's side, Thomas Cooper was descended from Yorkshire Quakers. He was born at Leicester in March 1805. Before he was twelve months old, his father, who was a travelling dyer, removed his family to Exeter. It is said that young Cooper learnt to read almost without instruction, and that at the age of three he was set to teach a youth of seven his letters. Mrs. Cooper, being left a widow when her son was only four years old, quitted Exeter for her native Lincolnshire, and settled down at Gainsborough, where the next twenty-five years of Thomas Cooper's life were passed. One of the first friends he made was Thomas Miller, the poet, who was learning the trade of basket-making when the youths became acquainted. In 1813 Cooper was sent to the Bluecoat School. From 1816 to 1820 he was at a private school, where he greatly extended his reading in history, poetry, and other subjects. Necessity compelled him to learn a craft for his livelihood, and at the age of fifteen he was apprenticed to a shoemaker. Whilst pursuing his trade, he gave up every

moment of spare time to his books, rising every morning at three or four o'clock in order to study. By the time he was twenty-three he had taught himself the Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and French languages, together with mathematics and a knowledge of English history and literature. His general reading was of the most extensive and varied character, and by way of recreation the omnivorous student would commit such masterpieces as *Hamlet* to memory. But circumstances at this time were very adverse for Cooper, and in describing the period long afterwards, he said: "I not unfrequently swooned away and fell along the floor when I tried to take my cup of oatmeal gruel at the end of the day's labour. Next morning, of course, I was not able to rise at an early hour; and then the next day's study had to be stinted. I needed better food than we could afford to buy, and often had to contend with the sense of faintness, while I still plodded on with my double task of mind and body." A serious illness ensued, during which he was once given up for dead.

In 1828 Cooper abandoned his trade of shoemaking and opened a school, to which the children of poor parents flocked eagerly. A year later, after many mental struggles and much spiritual wrestling, he joined the Wesleyan Methodist body, and became a local preacher. In 1834 he married the sister of a revivalist preacher in Lincoln, and established a school in that city. Here he had much to do with the foundation and prosperity of the Lincoln Mechanics' Institute, and the Lincoln Choral Society. He also acted as correspondent for the *Lincoln, Rutland, and Stamford Mercury*. It was at this time that he conceived the idea of his ambitious poem on "The Purgatory of Suicides." Cooper was a strong Radical in politics, and he wrote warmly in support of Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer, who was then in great favour with the Liberal electors of Lincoln. After a brief residence at Stamford, whither he moved upon leaving Lincoln, Cooper went to London in 1839, where he passed through many vicissitudes in endeavouring to launch himself upon a journalistic and literary career. For a brief period he resided at Greenwich, where he edited the *Kentish Mercury*. In 1840 he moved to Leicester, his birthplace, became associated with the *Leicestershire Mercury*, joined the Chartists, and conducted the Chartist organ, the *Midland Counties Illuminator*. Cooper soon became recognised as the

leader of the Chartists, and was nominated as a Parliamentary candidate both for the town and county, but was not returned. Among the converts to Chartist views, whom Cooper made by his eloquent appeals, was a youth of fifteen, named Anthony John Mundella, whose later career is sufficiently well known.

Cooper lived to see that Chartism was but the fly on the wheel during this great period of political agitation. Free trade became the one overwhelming cry of the nation, though there were many sanguine spirits who thought that an enlargement of the franchise, with the accompanying political demands embodied in the People's Charter, would take precedence of Corn Law Repeal. Cooper was one of these, and clung enthusiastically to the cause when others wavered, or altogether abandoned it. Being elected delegate from Leicester to the Chartist Convention at Manchester in August 1842, he went thither by way of the Staffordshire Potteries. He addressed a number of large gatherings of working men, and on 15th August took the chair at a great meeting held on the Crown Bank at Hanley. The fiat had already gone forth in various parts of the country that all labour should cease until the People's Charter became the law of the land, and in some places riots had occurred. The Hanley meeting passed off peaceably, and Cooper, personally, strongly appealed for the observance of law and order. But a riot had taken place at Longton, and the noisy spirits of Hanley endeavoured to promote a riot there also. Cooper, who was widely known, was advised by his friends to leave the town, and he did so. But he had scarcely got away when the spirit of turbulence triumphed, and Hanley was the scene of riot and excess. At Burslem, Cooper was arrested, but was released for lack of evidence. On reaching Manchester the city appeared to be almost in a state of siege. All the manufactories were closed, and cavalry and artillery were parading the streets. The convention was held on the 17th, and Cooper and other Chartists recommended armed resistance to the law. An address was afterwards printed and sent out for distribution by the executive. The police arrested some of the leaders, but Cooper got away to Leicester. Here several out-door demonstrations were held, but they were dispersed by the county police. Cooper was arrested on a warrant held by the constable of Hanley, and conveyed back to the Potteries. He was committed to Stafford Gaol on the charge of aiding in the riot

at Hanley, and while awaiting his trial he composed several of the simple tales which will be found in *Wise Saws and Modern Instances*, published in 1845. The assizes began on 11th October 1842, before Lord Chief Justice Tindal. Cooper was charged with the crime of arson, but as it was conclusively shown that he was in Burslem and not in Hanley at all at the time when the offence was committed, the jury returned a verdict of "Not Guilty." Two days later he was again arraigned, this time on the charges of conspiracy and sedition. The trial was postponed, however, and after five weeks Cooper was liberated. On arriving at Leicester he was made the hero of demonstrations throughout the town.

Divisions now assailed the Chartist party. The cause was practically ruined by the time when Cooper's second trial came on at the Stafford Assizes, 20th March 1843. Sir Thomas Erskine was the Judge, and the chief counsel against the prisoner was the scholarly Serjeant Talfourd, M.P. Cooper conducted his own defence, and delivered a powerful speech. But there were certain stubborn facts in the way of an acquittal, and the prisoner was found guilty of conspiracy and sedition, and sentenced to two years' imprisonment in Stafford Gaol. While in prison, Cooper began the composition of *The Purgatory of Suicides*, an epic poem in ten books, written in the Spenserian stanza. This "Mind History," as the author described it, dealt with the great social and religious questions of the past and present, making the spirits of suicides the actors or speakers.

Now, for some time, Cooper had been gravitating towards atheistical opinions. He had been treated by his Methodist friends in a manner which did not seem to him to savour of Christianity; his wife was ill and bed-ridden; and his own imprisonment reacted upon his sensitive nature. After his release from gaol in 1845 he studied the translation of Strauss begun by Charles Hennell and finished by George Eliot. He became, as he himself said, "fast bound in the net of Strauss," nor was he thoroughly able to break its meshes for twelve years. Cooper applied to Tom Duncombe, the eccentric member for Finsbury, to find him a publisher for his poem, and Duncombe gave him this characteristic note to Mr. Disraeli :—

"My dear Disraeli—I send you Mr. Cooper, a Chartist, red hot from Stafford Gaol. But don't be frightened. He won't

bite you. He has written a poem and a romance, and thinks he can cut out 'Coningsby' and 'Sybil'! Help him if you can, and oblige yours, T. S. DUNCOMBE."

Disraeli received Cooper very kindly, and gave him notes to Moxon and Colburn, but these and other publishers would do nothing; "poetry was an absolute drug in the market." Douglas Jerrold and Charles Dickens subsequently read *The Purgatory of Suicides*, of which they formed a high opinion, and Jerrold secured a publisher for it. The work appeared in September 1845, and the first edition of 500 copies was sold off before Christmas. It was succeeded by another poem, *The Baron's Yule Feast*, dedicated to the Countess of Blessington. Carlyle wrote to the author concerning his *Purgatory of Suicides*: "I have looked into your poem, and find indisputable traces of genius in it,—a dark, Titanic energy struggling there, for which we hope there will be clearer daylight by and by." Carlyle not only helped Cooper with advice, but by substantial acts of kindness. In 1846, while in the Lake District, Cooper had an interview with the venerable poet Wordsworth, who engaged him in a long conversation upon poets and poetry, and the events of the day. When they parted, Wordsworth said with emphasis, "The people are sure to have the franchise as knowledge increases; but you will not get all you seek at once, and you must never seek it again by physical force; it will only make you the longer about it."

In 1847 Cooper published his *Triumphs of Perseverance* and *Triumphs of Enterprise*. In the same year he joined Mazzini's new society, "The People's International League," which held its London meetings at the residence of the secretary, W. J. Linton, the engraver, in Hatton Garden. From the Chartist meetings and disturbances of 1848, however, he kept entirely aloof; and he was in complete disagreement with Feargus O'Connor over his land scheme. Cooper now became an active political and historical lecturer in London and in all parts of Great Britain and Ireland. His first novel, *Alderman Ralph*, was published in 1853, and another followed in the succeeding year. Towards the close of 1855 Cooper's opinions on religious questions underwent a change. He had never lectured as an infidel, but he had certainly given utterance to sceptical opinions. He now renounced these opinions, declared himself to be firmly convinced of the existence of a Divine Moral Governor of the

universe, and for many years lectured upon the Evidences of Christianity. In September 1856 he began a course of Sunday evening lectures and discussions with the London sceptics, and continued them until the end of May 1858. In the latter year Mr. Cowper-Temple found him employment in the Department of the Board of Health, where, in addition to routine work, he assisted Dr. Simon, of the Privy Council Office, in the preparation of his valuable report on vaccination. In 1859, having become thoroughly settled in his religious convictions, Cooper joined the general Baptist body, and from time to time preached under the auspices of that organisation. Shortly before taking this step he had held several public discussions with George Jacob Holyoake, but long afterwards he expressed his clear conviction that public discussions on the evidences of Christianity never do any good, and often do great harm. At length his health broke down, and Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Samuel Morley, Dr. Jobson, and other friends initiated a subscription for him in his illness and his need. Eventually a sum of £1300 was raised, which was used in the purchase of an annuity of £100 in the National Debt Office, for himself and his wife.

From 1867 to 1872 Cooper was again employed in lecturing. In 1878 his *Poetical Works* were collected and published, and shortly afterwards appeared *The Bridge of History over the Gulf of Time.* In 1882 he published his Autobiography, and since that period he has lived in retirement. During the course of his long career Cooper was thrown into contact with many of the most distinguished men of his time in literature and politics. His character was strongly marked, and it was impossible not to be struck by his honesty, his manliness, and his independence. His opinions on many questions were extreme, but his sincerity was undoubted.

In 1886, when the Home Rule Bill was introduced, Cooper said in a letter to the secretary of the Liberal Unionist Society in Lincoln: "I shall not vote at the city election, because I agree with neither of the candidates. The Tory candidate knows perfectly well that the old Chartist prisoner cannot vote for him. I cannot vote for the Liberal candidate, because, so far as my perception reaches, it would be voting in the dark. The Irish people share the common privileges of English, Scotch, and Welsh men. What is it they want besides? I ask the question because they never tell us what they really want.

Home Rule is a vague answer, for it may have twenty meanings, and none of them be good. Lately Mr. Gladstone has invented a new phrase—he proposes to give Ireland a 'statutory Parliament.' But what is that, and wherein does it differ from our Parliament? Why do the Irish want a separate Parliament? It would only help to make us more and more a divided instead of a United Kingdom. I must declare, whatever offence it may give to some people, that the Irish cry of Home Rule means separation from England, and that would be ruin to Ireland herself, and a costly war for England."

VISCOUNT SHERBROOKE

1811–1892

OBITUARY NOTICE, THURSDAY, JULY 28, 1892

TWENTY years ago Mr. Lowe's name was much better known than it now is. He had of late years sunk into bad health. Under several physical infirmities he always laboured, and they had increased. His nimble wit moved slowly. His bright intellect, interested in so much, had begun, his friends saw with regret, to be dimmed. In the House of Lords he rarely spoke, for some years past his voice was absolutely silent there. He, formerly so pugnacious and ever ready with a sharp word and apt answer, took of late no part in the struggles and controversies which were once his delight. Though withdrawn into the background, he could not be forgotten by this generation ; and when the names of many of his contemporaries, still bustling on the stage, are scarcely known, Robert Lowe will be remembered as one of the striking figures of English public life.

He was born eighty-one years ago in the rectory of Bingham, in Nottinghamshire, in the same year as Mr. Bright, and two years after Mr. Gladstone. He went to Winchester in Dr. Gabell's time, and he was not the least remarkable among a remarkable group. Among such contemporaries as Roundell Palmer, Cardwell, Eardley Wilmot, Monsell, and last, but certainly not least promising, William George Ward, he seemed marked out for future distinction. He took no part in games ; his weak sight debarred him through life from these. His scholarship was excellent ; his reputation for dialectical acuteness was still greater. He went in due course to Oxford. There he read hard. At the Union he spoke often and well ; in fact, he

and Ward were esteemed the best speakers of their time. He did not win any of the great University prizes, but he completed a brilliant career by taking a first class in classics and a second class in mathematics at the same time (1833) that Liddell, afterwards Dean of Christchurch, and Scott, afterwards Master of Balliol, took first classes. Two years later he was elected a fellow of Magdalen, and for several years he was fully occupied as a busy and successful coach. Even now linger memories of his triumphs in this field. Luckily, as events proved—most unfortunately as it seemed at the time—he failed in an attempt to obtain an office for which he was well fitted, but the holding of which would have doomed him to comparative obscurity. He applied for the chair of Greek in the University of Glasgow. The electors preferred Sir David Sandford. "To fail in that object," said Mr. Lowe himself some thirty years afterwards, "was the greatest disappointment that ever happened to me in my life." He was called to the Bar, but not caring for the drudgery, which was the only avenue to success open to one seeking it without the aid of professional friends, he turned his face towards the colonies, and in 1840 he landed at Sydney. The colony was then in its infancy. The population was small, and no great future seemed in store for it, for gold had not yet been discovered. Representative government had not been established; only the rudiments of it existed in a council of thirty-six members, of whom twenty-four were elected by the constituencies. The Governor, Sir George Gipps, who was glad to get the services of a clever debater able to hold his own with men of ability such as William Wentworth, nominated Mr. Lowe to a seat in the Legislative Council in November 1843. There he made good the expectations of his friends. But he was not made to be a placeman, his position became irksome to him, and he resigned his official seat only to be re-elected shortly afterwards for Sydney. From 1844 to 1850 his life was full and varied. He had no small practice as a barrister. He took part in every public movement in the colony, and he found time to contribute to the *Atlas* newspaper many clever articles on politics, and even Puseyism, poems, satires, *vers de société*. Had he remained in New South Wales the utmost success which the public life of the colony could offer was assured him. But tired of many of its concomitants, and allured by tempting prospects at home, he returned to England in 1850.

The Botany Bay barrister had not his fame to make in this country. His University reputation still survived ; some of his school and college friends had already become powers in the State, and he returned here at a time when attention was turned to colonial affairs, and when his experience was welcomed. In 1852 he was elected as a Liberal for Kidderminster, and in the House of Commons he was not slow to make his mark. Not that he quickly showed himself an orator, or at once fulfilled the high expectation of his friends. He too ostentatiously despised some of the devices which are the high-road to success. But his acuteness and courage were unquestionable ; he was a valuable ally in debate and a vigorous and harassing foe ; he won the esteem of Lord Palmerston and other leaders, and in due time he became Vice-President of the Board of Trade—an office which he held for three years—and one of the joint secretaries of the Board of Control. This part of his official life was not barren or unmemorable. He conducted through Parliament several measures of importance, and inspired not a few reforms in commercial legislation. Though it did not fall to him to give full effect to the principle of limited liability, he was the parent of measures which were the forerunners of the Act of 1862 ; and never, probably, was a clearer or more cogent argument for reform presented to Parliament than that contained in his speech in 1856, introducing the Partnership and Joint-Stock Companies Bills.

One part of Mr. Lowe's activity after his return to London must not be passed over in silence. He was an admirable and experienced journalist. In these columns he wrote much and often ; and never, in the opinion of his friends, did he show so well the variety and the extent of his powers as in his writings as a journalist. His administration at the Education Office will always be memorable. No one left so profound a mark upon our educational system as he. On the benefit of payment by results, and the superiority of examination over inspection, he strenuously insisted. The Revised Code, the embodiment of his policy, will always be condemned by one class of schoolmasters, but unquestionably is one of the chief facts in the history of English education. Mr. Lowe delighted to shake the pillars of educational institutions. His own University has not yet quite forgotten his address to the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution in November 1867. Nowadays the same

thesis is often enough maintained. But it was rare then to find a ripe scholar tolling the knell of the classics and even mathematics, and urging youth to turn to modern languages and "bread-and-butter" studies.

To a much larger circle Robert Lowe became known in 1866. The introduction of Mr. Gladstone's Reform Bill prefaced the most important passage in Mr. Lowe's career. All his life, in New South Wales as at the University, he had been a Liberal; in regard to many questions foremost in pleading for reform, and ready to go all lengths. But he was no thoroughgoing admirer of democracies. He was in many things of the school of Canning and Peel. He revered the Constitution as he found it. He was not sure that it could be much improved. At all events, he was not prepared to cast it into the crucible of party passion. Our future masters were not, he thought, ready to discharge the functions which they were called to exercise. So he opposed with the energy of true conviction the change so lightly, as he thought, undertaken. He stood in the breach, when so many others, his natural allies, turned tail. He did not quit his station, though next year Mr. Disraeli went over horse and foot to the enemy. Indefatigable, earnest, and unsparing he was in his opposition; and surely the Praeds, the Cannings, the Copleys—all who had once stood where he stood—must have looked down with approving eye on this brilliant swordsman, the courageous champion of a lost cause. The occasion was memorable—a peaceful revolution was in store for the country, and one at least of the combatants was not unworthy of the struggle. The controversy has sunk to rest. But his Reform speeches will still bear reading—

"Demagogues are the commonplace of history. They are to be found wherever popular commotion has prevailed, and they all bear to one another a strong family likeness. Their names float lightly on the stream of time; they are in some way handed down to us, but then they are as little regarded as the foam which rides on the crest of the stormy wave and bespatters the rock which it cannot shake. Such men, sir, I do not fear, but I have, I confess, some misgivings when I see a number of gentlemen of rank, of character, of property, and intelligence, carried away without being convinced, or even overpersuaded, into the support of policy which many of them in their inmost hearts detest and abhor. Monarchies exist by

loyalty, aristocracies by honour, popular assemblies by political virtue and patriotism; and it is in the loss of these things, and not in comets and eclipses, that we are to look for the portents that herald the fall of States."

In another famous passage he observed—

"To our hands at this moment is entrusted the noble and sacred future of free and self-determined government. We are about to surrender good for more than doubtful changes; we are about to barter maxims and traditions that have never failed for theories and doctrines that have never succeeded. Democracy you may have at any time. Night and day the gate is open that leads to that bare and level plain where every ant's nest is a mountain and every thistle a forest tree. But a Government such as England has, a Government the work of no human hand, but which has grown up the imperceptible aggregation of centuries—this is a thing we can only enjoy, which we cannot impart to others, and which once lost we cannot recover for ourselves. Because you have at once contrived to be dilatory and hasty heretofore, that is no reason for pressing forward rashly and unpremeditatedly now. We are not agreed upon details. We have not come to any accord upon principles. To precipitate a decision in the case of a single human life would be cruel—it is more than cruel, it is parricide, in the case of the Constitution, which is the life and soul of this great nation. If it is to perish, as all human things must perish, give it, at any rate, time to gather its robe about it, and to fall with dignity and deliberation.

> To-morrow—
> Oh, that's sudden, spare it, spare it:
> It ought not so to die."

Mr. Lowe failed; the tide flowed too strongly against him for him to roll back the advancing waves. The controversy over, the combatants at peace, there remained to Mr. Lowe a position properly his, but never accorded to him before. In 1868 he was elected first member for the University of London, and in the same year he was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer, an office which he held until 1873. It is the fashion to criticise harshly his fiscal administration; to forget the applause with which his first ingenious Budget was received; to dwell upon the fate of the ill-starred match-tax—best of

taxes in theory, worst, as it proved, in practice—to recall his ill-considered plan for establishing seigniorage, or "sweating the sovereign"; and, to dilate upon the slipshod manner in which, owing to his imperfect sight, he made his financial statements. But his virtues, if unpopular, were real, his achievements considerable. He said in a speech at Sheffield:

"During the last four years I have been able to take off twelve millions of taxes; and I ask you if you had been paying three millions extra for expenditure, as you would have done had the expenditure not been watched over, how much of these twelve millions would have been remitted? But the expenditure has diminished, and the consequence is that the revenue of this country having increased during the period that I had charge of the finances by a sum of twelve millions a year, every farthing of that twelve millions a year has gone into the pockets of the people, and not one sixpence of it has gone to increase the public expenditure. Nor, gentlemen, is that all; you have now, with the exception of Exchequer Bills, which are for the purpose of convenience, no important debt at all; for, although I have been obliged to increase the debt ten millions in order to pay for telegraphs, I have diminished the debt during four years by twenty-six millions. Even that is not all. I was called upon in 1870 to provide two millions on account of the war in Europe, and, as you know, in the present year (1873) I have been called upon to pay the sum of £1,600,000, half of the Alabama indemnity, making altogether £3,600,000. So prosperous have been the finances during this period that I have paid off the whole sum of £3,600,000 without borrowing a sixpence or imposing a tax on you at all. That is the answer which I have to give to those who have been so liberal in criticising."

These achievements and services should be remembered when we are told that he snubbed deputations, gibbeted people with designs on the public purse, and told the working man that he was venal and drunken. For a short time he was at the Home Office, where he did not show himself an exception to the rule that it is the grave of reputations. When the Liberals returned to power in 1880 he did not take office, and he was raised to the peerage as Viscount Sherbrooke.

His career as a politician then ended. He never again held office; but his influence upon public affairs did not cease. He

was a useful critic. His pithy words were always heard with acceptance, at least by cultivated men. When ill-directed sentiment was uppermost, when there was a conspiracy of hypocrisy not to say the plain truth, Mr. Lowe blurted it out. Popular he never was, nor aspired to be; he had too little knowledge of his countrymen, and, we might add, too little respect for them, to win their affections, to understand the depth of the convictions which he sometimes irritated with so much levity, or to save him from making signal mistakes. Witness his unfortunate speech at East Retford in 1878 with his ill-judged references to Her Majesty. But, right or wrong, judicious or ill-advised, his words must be listened to; his opponents winced under sentences which fell like strokes of a whip. In politics, society, or business he was the terror of bores, and scores of his sharp sayings still circulate in Downing Street and Whitehall. "Let us begin by assuming we are all d——d fools, and now to business," was his abrupt opening of proceedings on a committee of which X, a fussy bore, vacant and captious, was a member. "Why quarrel with your natural advantages?" was his query to a friend holding up an ear trumpet to listen to another bore.

On the last phase of the Irish question Lord Sherbrooke did not publicly express himself, but his opinions were no secret. A memorable passage in one of his speeches states them:

"I have no doubt myself that in Ireland more than anywhere else it is necessary our legislation should be founded on principles perfectly broad, perfectly well ascertained, perfectly defensible upon the most abstract philosophical grounds. I say in Ireland especially, because in the turgid vortex of Irish opinion and discord we have nothing but abstract principle to rely upon. You cannot give up principle without encouraging their dreams of reconquering land which has been taken from them. You cannot give up all that is asked by the Ultramontane Episcopate without encouraging them in dreams equally fatal to the welfare of the people of the country. You must take your stand upon something; the something might be truth, honesty, and sound principle. If it is necessary to maintain them in England, it is ten times more necessary to adhere to them with punctilious accuracy in Ireland. Our wisdom is when we have got existing institutions, whether they be land laws, colleges, or schools, founded on the best principles

we can find out for our own use in this country, and when we find them existing in Ireland, to stand by them and maintain them firmly, yielding to no clamour, seeking no momentary popularity, but doing our duty as far as we know with reference to what is true and good, and not with any idea of momentary expediency. If I were to describe what our policy with regard to Ireland ought to be in a few words, I should say it consisted in patience, forbearance, firmness, and impartiality."

Mr. Lowe wrote much, but he has left no book behind him to preserve an adequate record of his gifts. The collection of graceful verses which he was induced to publish a few years ago contained little more than scholarly trifles. Perhaps he had not thought sufficiently on any one subject to treat it authoritatively; he was too apt to be satisfied with a sharp, rapid glance. Political economy interested him much; he was an active member of the Political Economy Club. Until lately he regularly attended its meetings, and his duels with Mr. John Stuart Mill are still remembered there. But Mr. Lowe had not had leisure to make original investigations in the field of knowledge. His habit of exaggerating the importance of political economy, his obliviousness to the many necessary limitations of the teaching of Ricardo, showed that he had not watched the later developments of the science. True literary faculties, however, he possessed. He laid his hand with certainty upon the right word and phrase. Though prone to denounce the University training of his day, he was from first to last the outcome of it.

Qui viret in foliis venit a radicibus humor.

On the whole we look back on a full and fortunate life. In his little volume of verses we notice these lines, with a date attached which gives the secret of them:—

Success has come, the thing that men admire;
The pomp of office and the cares of State;
Ambition has nought left her to desire:
Success has come—but ah! has come too late.

But that could only have been a passing feeling. His was a healthy, vigorous nature; and regrets never showed themselves except in verse. He had almost exactly the career which in youth he would have most desired; and if he fought for lost

causes, his was not the nature to be much depressed by the result. His tall, handsome, striking figure, youthful complexion, and hair white before its time, as he fumbled and peered among his notes upside down, scattering sarcasm, wit, irony, and pointed sense among an audience alternately irritated and amused, will not fade soon from the memory of this generation.

Lord Sherbrooke was twice married,—in 1836 to Miss Georgiana Orred (she died in 1884), and in 1885 to Miss Caroline Sneyd; but he leaves no children, and the peerage becomes extinct. The second Lady Sherbrooke survives her husband.

JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER

1807–1892

OBITUARY NOTICE, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1892

IN John Greenleaf Whittier, who died early yesterday morning at Hampton Falls, New Hampshire, a remarkable man has passed away, and America has to mourn the loss of one of her foremost men of letters. Mr. Whittier, who, with the single exception of Longfellow, was the most popular of all American poets, was an earnest member of the Society of Friends. Down to the last he remained faithful to the principles and traditional practices of the Society, conforming even to its peculiarities of speech and garb in a community where such an observance must have been very trying at times to one of so retiring and sensitive a nature. His life was not distinguished for any remarkable episodes, though it was not devoid of political incidents and of stormy mental struggles. But for thirty years before his death he led a quiet and placid existence, "far from the madding crowd" and the busy haunts of men.

Whittier's first American ancestor went over to Massachusetts in 1638, and the conversion to Quakerism took place in the second generation of the family, after the settlement of the Bay Colony, and at a time when that sect was rigorously persecuted. It has not unnaturally been inferred that there was something of heredity in the unswerving constancy of Whittier to unpopular opinions. The poet was born on the 17th of December 1807, at Haverhill, Massachusetts, then a farming village, and one of the prettiest of the many hamlets which gave a peaceful charm to the New England

State. Little is known of his parents, so that we may consider them happy in their history. Whittier early fulfilled all the duties of a farmer's boy, driving the kine to and from pasture, riding to mill, fetching in wood for the fires, and helping in the various labours of haying and harvest. Up to his twentieth year he resided at the family homestead, acquiring only such simple education as was then thought necessary. In the rural districts of New England, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were no public libraries, no Lyceums, reading clubs, or debating societies. Books in the Whittier household, moreover, were scarce, and consisted only of about a score of volumes, chiefly relating to the doctrines of Quakerism and the lives of its founders. One novel and one book of poetry only found a lodgment there. But these circumstances, which were so untoward for one who longed to drink at the fountain of knowledge, were somewhat relieved when the young student was made free of the library of Dr. Elias Weld, of Haverhill. Apart from the inadequate training obtained in the district school, which was only open for about twelve weeks in midwinter, one year of academy life was all the scholastic education which the future poet received. A farm-hand taught him shoemaking, a common occupation during winter in the fishing and farming villages along the coast, and it was by this means he was enabled to attend the Haverhill Academy for the extra study just mentioned. Being, according to the current notions of the time, now sufficiently learned to be himself a teacher, he taught in the district school of West Amesbury during the winter of 1828, and spent the money thus earned on his own education.

A copy of Robert Burns's poems, which fell into Whittier's hands in his fourteenth year, stirred the literary ambition within him, and at the age of eighteen he contributed anonymous poems to the *Free Press*, a journal edited by W. Lloyd Garrison in Newburyport. Garrison discerned signs of promise in the effusions, and sought out the writer. A lasting friendship was formed between the two, and it is conjectured that this "had some influence in preparing Whittier to enlist in the anti-slavery crusade which began with the establishment of the *Liberator* in 1831, and afterwards caught so much of its inspiration from his fervid lyrics." Whittier contributed poems also to John Neal's *Yankee*, and to the *New England*

Magazine, where Oliver Wendell Holmes first revealed himself as the garrulous and delightful "Autocrat." But except as regards a certain limited circle of readers, it was as a prose writer that Whittier first became known. He contributed to the *American Manufacturer*, a journal in which tariffs and other questions of political economy were discussed, and of which he became editor. In 1830 he was appointed editor of the *Haverhill Gazette*, and shortly afterwards of the *New England Weekly Review*, published at Hartford, Connecticut. For some years before this he had carried on the farm, after the death of his father. Whittier's first volume, entitled *Legends of New England*, in prose and verse, was published at Hartford in 1831. It was succeeded in the following year by *Moll Pitcher*, a poetical tale, of which Mistress Mary Pitcher, a famous old witch of Nahant, was the heroine. On account of ill health, Whittier resigned the editorship of the *Weekly Review* in 1832, and returned home. For the next four or five years he was alternately a biographer, a politician, a farmer, and a legislator. He wrote a memoir of that gifted young writer J. G. C. Brainerd, which was prefixed to the second edition of his *Literary Remains*, and an essay entitled "Justice and Expediency, or Slavery considered with a view to its Abolition." It required no small amount of courage to give utterance at this period to anti-slavery sentiments; but Whittier never allowed anything to stand in the way of a fearless advocacy of his opinions.

In 1835 Whittier published his *Mogg Megone*. He became Secretary of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1836, and he afterwards removed to Philadelphia, where for a year (1838-9) he edited the *Pennsylvania Freeman*. This he did with such uncompromising vigour and earnestness that the printing-office of the journal was sacked and burned by a mob. But the editor was a man of passionate conviction, and, delicate as was his physical organisation, he faced many a brutal mob with unflinching composure. His enemies even were compelled to acknowledge the moral grandeur of the man. Nevertheless, he was never a mere fanatic, but was always ready to recognise and honour high qualities in his adversaries, as many of his poems show. He refused to follow Lloyd Garrison in his renunciation of political action as one means of reform. For some time he was a ceaseless worker

among the abolitionists, and edited the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*. In 1840 he took up his abode in Amesbury, a quiet village near his birthplace; and there—with the exception of six months spent at Lowell as editor of the *Middlesex Standard*—in the simple dignity of a frugal independence, the fruit of his own literary labours, he spent most of the remainder of his long life.

A volume of *Ballads*, issued in 1838, was followed by *Lays of My Home, and other Poems*, in 1843. *Miscellaneous Poems* appeared in 1844, and the same year the first English edition of Whittier's poems was published in London under the title of *Ballads and other Poems*, with an introduction by Eliezer Wright. Two prose works now followed, *The Stranger in Lowell*, in 1845, and *Supernaturalism in New England*, in 1847. *Leaves from Margaret Smith's Journal* appeared in 1849. This work purported to be the production of a young English maiden—on a visit to the Province of Massachusetts Bay in 1678-79—who jotted down in her journal whatever struck her as being likely to interest her friends in England. She seized the salient points of colonial life, and described the social and religious condition of the settlers, who were much exercised by Quakers and witchcraft. Altogether it was a very faithful reproduction of a bygone age. In 1849 Whittier collected his anti-slavery poems, written during a period of fifteen years, under the title of *Voices of Freedom*. While they were serviceable in their day, they manifested less of the essence of poetry than any of the author's other productions, and, as the subject which called them forth is no longer a battle-ground for contending parties, they are little read now. But that the poet even here could rise occasionally to a fine and touching strain, is shown in his "Farewell of a Virginia Slave Mother to her Daughters sold into Southern Bondage." In 1850 was published *Old Portraits and Modern Sketches*, and in 1853 *Songs of Labour and other Poems*. The latter volume witnessed another expansion of the poet's mind, these objective sketches being very vigorous in expression, and infused with a hopeful spirit for the future toilers of the race. By some critics these poems have been regarded as the most characteristic of all their author's productions, and those by which foreign readers would most readily recognise him as an American poet.

During the period shortly before and shortly after the Civil

War Whittier's works followed each other in rapid succession. In 1853 came *The Chapel of the Hermits, and other Poems*, and *A Sabbath Scene: a Sketch of Slavery in Verse.* The former was based upon an incident related in a note to St. Pierre's *Études de la Nature.* Rousseau and St. Pierre had arrived at the habitation of the hermits just as they were reciting the Litanies of Providence. The visitors were much moved, and offered up their own devotions. Rousseau confessed to the feeling of peace and happiness which pervaded his soul, when St. Pierre exclaimed, "If Fénélon had lived you would have been a Catholic." Rousseau replied with tears in his eyes, "Oh, if Fénélon were alive, I would struggle to get into his service, even as a lackey!" This incident the poet has utilised for contrasting the characters of Rousseau and St. Pierre, and also for the enforcement of certain moral sentiments. *Literary Recreations and Miscellanies* was published in 1854, and *The Panorama and other Poems* in 1856. A complete edition of Whittier's works was issued in 1857 in two volumes, and his next original work was *Home Ballads and Poems*, published in 1860.

In his seclusion, Whittier was far from being insensible to what was going on in the outer world; nor did he neglect his duties as a citizen. As the late Mr. Russell Lowell remarked of his friend—

"Whenever occasion offered, some burning lyric of his flew across the country like the fiery cross, to warn and rally. Never mingling in active politics (unless filling the office of presidential elector may be called so), he probably did more than anybody in preparing the material out of which the Republican party was made. When the Civil War was impending he would have evaded it if possible by any concession short of surrender, as his *Word for the Hour* (January 1861) shows. While the war continued he wrote little with direct reference to it, and never anything that showed any bitterness towards the authors of it. After it was over he would have made the terms of settlement liberal and conciliatory. He was too wise and too humane to stir the still living embers of passion and resentment for any political end, however dear to him."

In 1862 Whittier published one of the finest of his works, *Snow Bound.* There is no English poem with which it can fairly be compared unless it be Burns's "Cottar's Saturday Night." New Englanders regard it as one of their greatest

literary treasures. The snow-bound family which the poet describes was his father's family, and each member of it is invested with a striking individuality as he or she describes exciting incidents connected with Indian raids, or depicts pastoral scenes of quietude and beauty. It was a perfect idyl of New England life and manners, and possesses a historical value as a vivid picture of modes of life even then obsolete. This volume was followed by another complete edition of the author's poetical works, and then in 1863 appeared *In War Time, and Other Poems,* closely succeeded by *National Lyries.* Then came a collection of his prose works, after which, in 1867, was issued *The Tent on the Beach,* where the poet resumed his character of a story-teller in verse, though with a wider range than he had hitherto shown in the choice of subjects. *Among the Hills, and other Poems* (1868) was followed by a complete illustrated edition of the author's poetical works, corresponding in appearance and typography with the prose works. A volume of *Ballads of New England,* issued in 1869, contained sixty illustrations by various artists. *Miriam, and other Poems* was published in 1870, and two years later appeared *The Pennsylvanian Pilgrim, and other Poems,* which had for its chief character Francis Daniel Pastorius, who drew up the first protest made in America by a religious body against negro slavery. *Hazel Blossoms* was published in 1874, *Mabel Martin* in 1875, and in the latter year also appeared a new collected edition of the poet's works, comprising all the poems that he had written up to the date of publication. The subsequent works of Whittier were written and published in the order named—the noble *Centennial Hymn,* 1876; *The Vision of Eehard, and other Poems,* 1878; *The King's Missive, and other Poems,* 1881; *Bay of Seven Islands, and other Poems,* 1883; *Poems of Nature,* 1885; and *St. Gregory's Guest and recent Poems,* 1886. A final edition of his poetical and prose works, supervised by the poet himself, was issued in seven volumes in 1888-89. This edition likewise included the poems of his sister, Elizabeth Hussey Whittier, who, like her brother, was a member of the Society of Friends, and an ardent advocate of liberty.

Whittier has generally been regarded as the most distinctively American of all American poets, with the one exception, perhaps, of William Cullen Bryant. But Whittier had a wider

range than Bryant, and was more intense in feeling. He had both action and reflection in his poetry. His "Floyd Ireson" is an excellent ballad, and it may almost be said of him that what Sir Walter Scott did for Scotland, Whittier did for New England. His poems, dealing with individual characters, are also remarkable for their individuality and their graphic force. Take "Cassandra Southwick," for example, where we see portrayed a veritable woman, noble in her tribulations, and glorious in her triumph: or "Randolph of Roanoke," a splendid tribute to the memory of a great man, and all the more praiseworthy that it was wrung from the lips of an opponent. "The Quaker poet saw the great Virginia slave-holder as he was—a man to be known and respected." Strikingly, also, Whittier drew Daniel Webster in "Ichabod." That famous statesman "disappointed the moral sense of New England by the stand he took about the Fugitive Slave Law, and was sadly and sternly reprobated, even by his admirers"; Whittier grieved over his defection, but "with a noble manliness that was as honourable to Webster as to himself." Whittier's poetical compositions may be divided into six categories—picturesque poems dealing with Indian character and scenery; legendary poems descriptive of the colonial life of the Puritans and the Quakers; anti-slavery poems; songs relating to labour; poems in celebration of freedom; and religious poems. Many of his devotional lyrics recall those of Cowper, and some of them have now taken a permanent place in English hymnology. The most salient features in Whittier's verse were those also observable in his personal character—sincerity, simplicity, earnestness, and manliness. No criticism could more happily describe his worth generally than the verses which he prefixed as a "proem" to one of his earlier volumes, and from which we extract these two stanzas—

> Yet here at least an earnest sense
> Of human right and weal is shown;
> A hate of tyranny intense,
> And hearty in its vehemence,
> As if my brother's pain and sorrow were my own.
>
> O Freedom! if to me belong
> Nor mighty Milton's gift divine,
> Nor Marvel's wit and graceful song,
> Still with a love as deep and strong
> As theirs, I lay, like them, my best gifts on thy shrine!

For some years before his death Whittier resided at Oak Knoll, Danvers, Massachusetts, a delightful home, surrounded with sylvan glades and beautiful oak vistas. Here he was made the recipient of affectionate demonstrations on the part of his friends—first on completing his seventieth year, and again in December 1887, when he attained the age of fourscore years. This latter event was also publicly celebrated in Boston and elsewhere.

M. RENAN

1823–1892

Obituary Notice, Monday, October 3, 1892

France has lost one of her most unquestioned literary glories, one of the most generous and large-minded of her philosophers, one of her thinkers most imbued with classical philosophy and Oriental learning, one of those who have brought to the highest point the beauty, purity, and clearness of the French language. M. Renan died after an illness of only a few days, but following on some weeks of debility and suffering. He had been brought back with some difficulty from Brittany, where he had passed the holidays amidst those familiar associations by which he loved to be surrounded, and of which he spoke with so peculiar a charm. As soon, however, as he felt himself in serious danger he was anxious to return to Paris, to die within the walls of the Collège de France, of which he was the head, which he loved so much, and where, to use his own expression, "the days were more productive and the nights more serene." While in Brittany he had been troubled with insomnia, and his son Ary Renan, a young painter of much promise, was forced to spend part of the night in reading to him. On returning to Paris, he was confined to his bed, and his sufferings prevented his listening to reading, but in the short intervals of ease he spoke with the resigned serenity of a philosopher, and even with something of the hopeful temper of a Christian. At two o'clock this morning, four hours before his death, he turned to his wife and said, "Why are you sad?" "Because I see you suffer," she replied. "Be calm and resigned," replied the dying man; "we undergo the laws of that nature of which we

are a manifestation. We perish, we disappear, but heaven and earth remain, and the march of time goes on for ever." He soon lost consciousness, and in a few hours was dead.

It is thought that France will give a national funeral to this great writer, this powerful thinker, equalled only by Victor Hugo in the admiration of his contemporaries. In his private relations he was the most charming, simple, and amiable of men, and when, at home or elsewhere, he was seen leaning back in a chair, his hands clasped on his breast, his head slightly leaning to the left, his eyes half closed, but listening with sustained attention to what was said to him, as though any man who approached him could teach him something, you felt that he was full of indulgence for his fellow-men and of ardent curiosity for all that interests the human mind. For more than forty years—from 1848, when the French Academy awarded him the Volney Prize, up to his latest works, his early reminiscences, and his admirable *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel*, but barely completed—each successive production of his intellect and learning made a great impression, and even amid the greatest political and social agitations fixed itself on the attention of the world. For a happily very brief period of his life he was tempted by politics. His programme was summed up in these four phrases, which embody the idea of the philosopher more than of the politician, when in 1869 he was a candidate for the Chamber:—"No war, no revolution, progress, liberty." It is fortunate that he was defeated, withdrawn from politics, and restored to literature, which he never again quitted.

Educated at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, destined for the priesthood, solicited and encouraged to persevere in that vocation, Renan tore himself from his surroundings on finding that implicit faith had forsaken him. A mind like his could not long remain a prey to hesitation. He sought eternally to understand, and for him miracle and legend vanished, and he renounced being a priest. He preserved, however, a touching recollection of his stay at the seminary, and, in spite of the attacks, calumnies, and insults lavished on him by the Catholics, who alleged that he had betrayed them, he never uttered or wrote a bitter word against the Sulpiciens, whose life and labours he had shared, and to whom he remained profoundly grateful. If, moreover, his *Life of Jesus*, which appeared thirty years ago, which made so great an uproar, which has ever since

been constantly combated, and to which one of the most eloquent preachers of the day, Père Didon, virtually replied two years ago by his erudite and earnest *Jésus Christ*—if that work raised against him all the anger and indignation of extreme Catholics, he himself always cherished the predilection for the moral doctrine of Christianity, preaching charity, love, and pardon, of which Christ was the founder and the highest personification. He was no atheist or freethinker. He believed in God, and, though doing his utmost to reduce Christ to the proportions of a divinely-inspired philosopher, he had a submissive respect and obedient admiration for every syllable falling or reported to have fallen from the lips of the Master. This was just why he was anxious to discriminate between what he found to be authoritative and what appeared to him to be inauthentic. In no conversation with him did we ever detect a single word which was that of a freethinker, and if he spoke harshly of priests, it was because he reproached them for misconceiving the grand figure of Christ and impairing the celestial beauty of his character.

His visit to the East, which he accomplished under somewhat romantic conditions, and in which he sought to tread the very shores and byeways trodden by Christ, had left indelible traces in his mind. The East appealed to him. The great barren plains, without shade or breeze, had imbued him with their melancholy monotony, and from that moment he endeavoured to solve the problems which disquieted him much more with a view to pacify his own mind than to give fresh light to fellow-men groping their way. His philosophy gradually took the shape of large-minded indulgence and resignation, and, if a man's last words embody the idea of his whole life, that philosophy is found in the sentence just quoted:—"We disappear, but heaven and earth remain." The unending current which impels mankind to love had also borne him along with it, and his *Abbesse de Jouarre*, described by some as indicating senility, is a natural reversion to his earliest impressions, and a deliberate homage to that tenderness of soul and heart which cannot be stifled without occasioning bitter regrets. But even if his works did not bear the traces of his profound and constant meditations, they would remain the finest monument raised by genius in honour of the French language, an almost inimitable model of clear thought and

crystalline expression, precise and elegant, the culminating point reached by the tongue of Bossuet and of Fénélon. Renan could die with a conviction of having added treasures of reflection and learning to the intellectual patrimony of his country, its language, literature, and philosophy, and with having shown generations to come that there is no true science without an unshakable faith in the existence and justice of God.

Ernest Renan was born on the 27th of February 1823, at Tréguier, a small town on the coast of Brittany. His father was captain of a coasting vessel, and perished mysteriously at sea. His mother was a Gascon, with the joyous, sympathetic temper of the south. On her husband's death his mother, reduced to poverty, retired for a time to the neighbouring town of Lannion. On going back to Tréguier, Ernest was sent to the municipal college, where he was a model of studiousness and good conduct. The Abbé, afterwards Bishop Dupanloup, then head of the St. Nicolas du Chardonnet Seminary, in Paris, happened to hear of his collegiate successes, and, being anxious to recruit promising youths for the priesthood, sent for him to Paris. At Issy and St. Sulpice he continued his studies, especially in philosophy and Hebrew. But while in minor orders his faith in Catholicism gave way, and he left the seminary, to the great regret but with the sincere respect of its professors. The history of this crisis he has fully related in his souvenirs and in the biography of his sister Henriette, printed for private circulation. His sister's letters from abroad, where she was acting as governess, had a considerable influence on the formation of his opinions at this critical moment. He supported himself by teaching in Paris while continuing his own studies.

In 1848 he obtained the Volney Prize for an essay on Semitic languages, and two years later a second prize for an essay on the study of Greek in the Middle Ages. In the meantime his sister, who had returned from Poland, had joined him in his modest lodgings. In 1849 he went to Italy and collected the materials for his doctoral thesis on Averroes. In 1851 he received an appointment in the Paris National Library, and in 1856 he succeeded Augustin Thierry in the Academy of Inscriptions. He had married a daughter of Henry Scheffer, brother of Ary Scheffer, and like him a painter. In 1860, with his wife and sister, he went to Syria. There his sister died, and he himself was dangerously ill. In 1863 he was nominated

Professor of Hebrew at the Collège de France, but there was a noisy scene at his opening lecture, and the course was suspended by the Government, which offered him as compensation a post at the National Library ; but this he refused. He enjoyed the intimacy of Prince Napoleon, and was considered a Liberal Imperialist, but he was an Independent and unsuccessful candidate for the Chamber in 1869. During the war of 1870 he vainly appealed to Strauss for intervention in favour of France. He was reinstated in his professorship by the Republic, and retained it till his death, while latterly holding also the office of Rector, and consequently residing at the College. He had, of course, only a handful of auditors in a small stuffy room, but foreigners, especially Englishmen, eagerly embraced this opportunity of seeing and hearing a man so much talked about. His unprepossessing physiognomy never failed to surprise those who had admired his writings, and that physiognomy was even exaggerated in the portrait by M. Bonnat in the last Salon. His ungraceful posture as he leaned over the table, or threw himself back in his chair, was also quite out of keeping with the ideal conception of him. But his voice had a decided charm.

On the creation of the Senate, Renan expressed a wish to enter it, but he stood no chance. Though with his easy optimism he accepted the Republic, he almost to the last preferred a mild despotism, which should patronise *savants* and men of letters, and allow full liberty of thought except in politics. In 1878 he succeeded Claude Bernard at the French Academy, and M. Mézières, who welcomed him, mingled his compliments with some good-humoured sarcasms on his historical inventiveness. It fell to Renan to welcome several new Academicians, and his speeches were models of elegance, criticism, and banter. In 1888 he was promoted Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour. His delivery of the Hibbert Lectures in England will be well remembered. He leaves a widow and two children, the son a painter of the Puvis de Chavannes school, while the daughter, who received the Protestant rite of confirmation, is married to an erudite Greek, M. Psichare. Subjoined is a list of M. Renan's works :—*Vie de Jésus, Les Apôtres, St. Paul, Antéchrist, Les Évangiles et la Seconde Génération Chrétienne, Marc Aurèle et la fin du Monde Antique, Le Livre de Job, Le Cantique des Cantiques, L'Ecclésiaste, Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques, Histoire du Peuple d'Israel, Études d'Histoire Religieuse,*

Nouvelles Études d'Histoire Religieuse, Averroës et l'Averroïsme, Essais de Morale et de Critique, Mélanges d'Histoire et de Voyages, Questions Contemporaines, La Réforme Intellectuelle et Morale, De l'Origine du Langage, Dialogues Philosophiques, Caliban, L'Eau de Jouvence, Le Prêtre de Nemi, L'Abbesse de Jouarre, Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse, Discours et Conférences, L'Avenir de la Science, Mission de Phénicie, Conférences d'Angleterre. The two remaining volumes of his *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel* are ready for publication, and it is understood that he has also left some further reminiscences which are not to be published for five years.

M. Renan was a Breton by birth, and, as he loved to say, a Breton with a spice of the Gascon by nature. In 1823 he was born at Tréguier, and in that ancient city, with a strong ecclesiastical flavour, over which the Revolution had lightly passed—a city, to use M. Renan's own words, "stranger to commerce and industry, a vast monastery where no sound of the outer world penetrated, where people called vanity what others seek after, and where what the laity called illusions were deemed the only realities"—he passed his childhood, and contracted, he tells us, a bent which he never lost. His forefathers, the Renans, had come, he tells us, from the county of Cardigan "under the guidance of Fragan about 480." What is more certain is that his people were simple, honest Bretons, who early saw in their clever young kinsman a future professor at the College of Tréguier, perhaps Grand Vicar of St. Brieuc, and perhaps in the end a distinguished Bishop. Certain it is that from his earliest age he was destined for the Church. "I was born a priest *a priori*, as so many others are born soldiers or magistrates." In after years he was wont to protest against the narrowing isolation of his early education. But in his impartial moods he did justice to his preceptors, and to the excellent instruction in Latin and other subjects which he received at their hands. He knew how to profit by it. His powers of acquisition were prodigious, his passion for knowledge precocious and not to be satiated. In 1838 he won all the prizes at the College of Tréguier; and the keen-sighted Abbé Dupanloup, who then directed the famous seminary of St. Nicolas du Chardonnet, and, in fact, was the life and soul of that institution, saw in the clever student a future helper. "In a moment my fate was decided. 'Bring him hither,' said the impetuous

Superior. I was fifteen and a half; we had no time for reflection. I was spending the holidays with a friend in a village near to Tréguier, and in the afternoon of the 4th of September a messenger came post-haste to find me. I recall that coming back as if it were yesterday. I had to walk a league across country. The ringing of the evening Angelus echoed from village to village, filling the air with a gentle melancholy and calm, an image of the life which I was giving up for ever. The next day I departed for Paris; on the 7th I saw a host of things as new to me as if I had been suddenly dropped into France from Tahiti or Timbuctoo."

It was in truth the opening of a wholly new life. Three or four years he passed in St. Nicolas du Chardonnet, and a further period of training for the priesthood was spent in the seminary of Issy, near Paris. He threw himself with ardour into the studies of the place. "C'était une sorte de fureur," to use his own words in his *Souvenirs d'Enfance*. His next step was to enter St. Sulpice, in 1843, to study theology. Here he became acquainted, partly through attending the course of lectures at the Collège de France by M. Étienne Quatremère, with the writings of the German Biblical critics; what were the exact stages in the great change which took place is not clear; M. Renan's later explanations of his mental revolution left it half unexplained. What is certain is that in September 1845 he announced his resolution to quit the seminary. "I cannot," he said, "become a priest without culpable hypocrisy."

Remonstrances were unavailing; and on the 6th of October 1845 he left St. Sulpice to begin the life of a man of letters. As a teacher of Oriental languages, and subsequently as the holder of a post in the Manuscript Department of the National Library, he was able to supply his few wants; for his wants were simple, his life then as afterwards that of a scholar. Perhaps his first literary success was his essay "De l'Origine du Langage," which appeared in 1848, and which attracted the favourable attention of Grimm and other philologists. It supported the thesis, much more novel then than now, that language was not a mechanical invention, coming at a late stage in man's history, but the creation of the human faculties acting spontaneously. A succession of works marked not only by erudition, but by a rare charm and matchless distinction of style—in particular his *History of the Semitic Languages*—brought him fame, and led to

his being intrusted with literary missions to Italy and Syria. In 1862 he was chosen to fill the Chair of Hebrew at the College of France ; and it will not be forgotten that his opening lecture was made the occasion of a hostile demonstration so serious as to induce the Government to refuse to ratify the appointment.

Outside France he first became known by the publication of his *Vie de Jésus* in 1863. The writings of Strauss and Baur had early profoundly affected him ; his visit to Syria led him to think further of the subject ; and the result was a volume which excited as much controversy perhaps as any book of this century. It would be impossible to give here even the names of the books and pamphlets which, with prodigious fecundity, M. Renan poured forth during his literary life of more than forty years. The *Histoire des Origines du Christianisme*, *Les Apôtres*, *Saint Paul et Sa Mission*, *Marc Aurèle*, *L'Église Chrétienne*, followed each other in quick succession ; and even while they were being published he was an indefatigable contributor to the records of the Académie des Inscriptions. Nor did he confine himself to the provinces of the philologist and historian. He travelled often into the realms of philosophy and literature. He even essayed, though with indifferent success, the art of the dramatic author, and in the *Débats* and *Revue des Deux Mondes* he was at one time a frequent contributor. More than once he was tempted to begin a political career. Fortunately for him, he was uniformly rejected. Even if he had been gifted with that practical capacity of which he admitted he was absolutely destitute, his political creed, embodied in the saying "La jalousie, principe de la démocratie," did not recommend him to a French constituency. Perhaps the only time he played a political part of importance was when he addressed to Strauss and other German *savants* a letter of rebuke for their exultation over the prostration of France.

In his late years everything was done by his country to make amends for the treatment which he experienced when he was deprived of the Professorship of Hebrew. He was elected a member of the Academy in 1878, and Vice-Rector of the Collège de France in 1883 ; and his countrymen delighted to speak of him as the foremost man of letters in Europe.

Whether this is a correct verdict, or what is the proper and final place of M. Renan in literature, it is premature to say. Great authorities have criticised his scholarship, and his value as

a historian is vitiated by faults which inferior men are able to shun. "So strong is M. Renan's desire to fill up all gaps in history," says M. Scherer, "that he sometimes inserts in the narrative a point of detail which looks well and fills out the situation, and then tells his reader in a note not to believe it." He who strove to be in all things a critic was himself subject to the very weaknesses from which criticism is supposed to emancipate men. But when all is said as to his failings, there must remain a sense of his supreme literary gifts. His horizon was wide; he looked at men and things in a large way; and he moved easily and habitually in regions of thought to which few writers can reach. Whether the resources of the French language were ever known better to any one than to him, only his countrymen can determine; but to find his equal it may be necessary to go back to his compatriot Chateaubriand, whom in so many respects he resembled. Never, probably, has French prose been made so musical, flowing, pliant, expressive of so much, as under his touch. None of his generation, it is certain, surpassed him in that artistic finish which art cannot reach, and in that winning *naïveté* with which the simplicity of ignorance cannot vie. The mould in which he was cast is broken; and even if France should have deeper scholars, more sober and accurate historians, and tongues as eloquent, never again will be found that union of faculties which gave him supreme distinction in the eyes of his countrymen.

LORD TENNYSON

1809–1892

Obituary Notice, Friday, October 7, 1892

The death of Lord Tennyson extinguishes the most brilliant light in English literature—a light which has shone to the last with unwaning lustre. He linked us with the golden age of the famous poets of the beginning of the century, and his loss, following on that of his old friend Browning, leaves a blank we can scarcely hope to fill. Though the late Laureate had kept his powers and much of his natural energy to the last, he has died in the fulness of years as of fame. He lived to a good old age; he did great and imperishable work; his name had long been a charmed household word around the hearths and in the hearts of his admiring countrymen, for he was eminently the poet of the feelings and the affections; and if he cared for lower honours and for riches, he had won enough of both to satisfy his ambition. The greatest or most conspicuous men are often the least to be envied; but we should say that few lots were more enviable than his. The son of a clergyman in affluent circumstances, life from the first was made smooth and pleasant to him. From the first he found delight in a congenial vocation; and his genius became his philosopher and guide in the boundless realms of the fancy. When most boys are still drudging at the *gradus*, or beginning to labour over the grindstone of Latin verse, he wrote flowing poetry, which is readable, and was full of promise for the future. The promise was promptly recognised by those who were nearest and dearest to him; and he had never to complain of that lack of encouragement which may chill the susceptible temperament of the poet. Perhaps the excessive

partiality of his friends, though the triumphs of the future justified their foresight, may have helped to provoke the severity of unkindly critics. Yet many an aspiring and self-confident poet would have given much to secure such universal notice as was speedily bestowed upon Tennyson. Susceptible he might be, like all refined and original spirits, but nature had gifted him with sterner qualities as well. He had a self-confidence which some pronounced overweening, and a resolute devotion to his art which rose superior to satire. If the one and the other served to blunt the shafts of the critics, they saved him as well from the injudicious flatteries of his enthusiastic admirers. At one time he seemed to stand at "the parting of the ways"; and a weaker man might have chosen the worse, which would have led him downwards towards fluent mediocrity. Tennyson at that critical turning-point gave proof of his good sense and worldly wisdom. On calmer thought he profited by the stinging criticisms which had provoked him at first into indiscreet outbursts of temper. That is proved by the suppression in subsequent editions of the poems which had been most mercilessly ridiculed. He meditated and laboured over his gracefully-polished work; each melodious line and measured couplet was the deliberate expression of his feelings; he wrote slowly and published leisurely. The rich exuberances of fancy were lopped and pruned; his deepest sentiments were seldom obscure; the loftiest flights of his philosophical mysticism rarely carried him beyond reach of the perceptions of his intelligent worshippers. In short, his methods were the very opposite of those of the greatest of his rivals, and he had his full reward. His genius ripened steadily and surely. His reputation increased with the appreciative and sympathetic, as his popularity was widely extended among the crowd. With a single exception, which was soon forgotten or forgiven, each fresh publication was as warmly welcomed as it had been eagerly expected. In the enjoyment of ample means, absolute master of his time and of his arrangements, he made his favourite recreation his regular occupation, writing just as much or as little as he pleased. He led the easy life of a country gentleman as he understood it, drawing inspiration for his scenery and his minutely-exquisite painting of nature from the lanes and downs that surrounded his dwellings. He had the choice of two country residences in the fairest districts of

southern England ; he had books at will as the companions of his solitude when he cared for solitude ; and we may add, though it sounds something of a bathos, he found unfailing solace in an inexhaustible tobacco-jar. He chose to hold aloof from the so-called "society" that would have gladly courted and petted him, because he disliked anything in the shape of social dissipation. But from his school time and college days to extreme old age no one was more fortunate in the attachment of familiar friends, and had he not been as happy with his children as in his marriage, he might hardly have lived so much of a hermit. So far as we can know, the worst trouble of his later years was the notoriety that attracted troops of admirers to gaze at the roof that sheltered the Laureate, and, if possible, to force the *consigne* at his gates. It is said that he was fairly driven by obtrusive tourists from the home which lay near their beats in the Isle of Wight to pass the summer and autumn months in less accessible solitudes in Sussex. But if these were among his worst troubles, we may be sure we are right in pronouncing his lot a pre-eminently happy one.

Alfred Tennyson was born on 5th August 1809, at Somersby, a small village in Lincolnshire. His father was rector of the parish, and remarkable for bodily strength and stature, which may help to explain his son's longevity and the perennial vigour of mind which prolonged his powers of giving pleasure beyond reasonable expectation. The rector, though living remote from the world, was not only a gifted but an accomplished man, and most of his many children took after him. Alfred was the third of seven brothers, and they all either turned naturally towards intellectual amusements or were trained to them. They read much and wrote habitually. The Rector of Somersby devoted himself to his children, and Alfred's education, like that of his brothers, began under the care of their father at the village school. All the time, whether as a child or a schoolboy, he was studying elsewhere than in printed books. He was reading and eagerly drinking in facts, fancies, and inspirations from the richly-illuminated volume of nature, and he never wearied of it. It was then he was grounding himself in those minute details of natural history and botany which he was to turn to such graceful account. He is said to have been no mean artist, too, and at all events the scenery and the landscapes about him were indelibly

impressing themselves on his memory. Lincolnshire is not the most romantic of English counties, nor is the neighbourhood of Somersby especially picturesque. Nevertheless it is neither flat nor tame, and with its fields, fens, and marsh flowers it has characteristic charms of its own which have stamped themselves on the most pleasing pages of the Laureate's earlier poetry. There to the north of his native village rose "the long dun wolds" of the ballad of "Oriana" that were "ribb'd with snow" when the Norland whirlwinds were storming in the winter. Thence, or from the neighbouring heights, with the hero of his "Locksley Hall," he overlooked

> —the sandy tracts
> And the hollow ocean-ridges roaring into cataracts.

for the sea stretches away at no great distance. Around many a Lincolnshire hall and quaint old farm-house was such a moat as encircled Mariana's Grange, where

> About a stone-cast from the wall
> A sluice with blacken'd waters slept,
> And o'er it many, round and small,
> The cluster'd marish-mosses crept.

Each piece of minute description in the earlier poems seems to be the fond and vivid reflection of photographs on the memory. There are gray hills in the woodlands, with "Hangers" like that of Selborne; the very numbers of the species of the trees standing before the rectory door are given exactly; but, above all, we may identify the brook with its surroundings—the brook that ripples and murmurs through many of his pieces, besides the "Miller's Daughter" and the "Ode to Memory." It flowed at the bottom of the rectory garden, and like his Lotus-eaters he must have often dreamed away the summer days upon its banks, soothed by the drowsy melody of the water, as it "purled o'er matted cress and ribbed sand." We may remark, by the way, how fond he was from first to last of certain epithets which are invariably suggestive and expressive. "Ribbed sand," for example, though it might have been borrowed from Coleridge, is perpetually recurring. Then everywhere in those poems we recognise the natural history as well as the scenery of his native parish. We have

"the many-wintered crow that leads the clanging rookery home"; we have "the wanton lapwing," and many another bird of passage that frequents the dreary moorland and the barren shore. Like Scott, who was observed making notes of the wild flowers on Greta banks, Tennyson was never content with picturesque generalisation in his descriptions. As no one can talk a language like a native, who has not mastered it in his youth, so Tennyson could never have been so universally at home with nature had it not been for the close observations of the botanising and bird-nesting rambles of his boyhood. He was as precocious in his study of nature as in his poetry. It is Mr. Holbrook, the old country gentleman in "Cranford," who quotes the phrase "black as ash-buds in March" as a fact which he did not know "till this young man comes and tells me." So the marsh and moat botany in "Mariana" is almost perfect in its technical precision, and yet how wonderfully the creepers and the trailing water-plants have interwoven themselves with the beauties of the verse. With unconscious, or at least imperceptible, effort his genius turns all it touches to his purpose; and the trailers on a wall, as a gardener might have catalogued them, are poetical as the figure of the Pleiads on a stormy night, "glittering like a swarm of fireflies tangled in a silver braid." If we go down to the insect world it is always the same, for the lustre of his genius, like the microscopic lens, sets off the tiniest of objects in unsuspected beauty. He can brighten the stagnant surface of a mill-pond; and there are few more finely expressed parables in his poems than that he draws from the glittering dragonfly in "The Two Voices"—

> An inner impulse rent the veil
> Of his old husk: from head to tail
> Came out clear plates of sapphire mail.
>
> He dried his wings: like gauze they grew;
> Thro' crofts and pastures wet with dew
> A living flash of light he flew.

If there be anything to surpass that in similar style in our English poets we should be glad to see it. And if we have dwelt at length on his education by nature, it is because its influence on his poetry is hardly to be overrated. Books are well; the intimacy with cultivated minds which Tennyson enjoyed and appreciated to the fullest extent is even better;

but best of all for the poet is the familiarity with nature, which teaches him to read her very innermost soul, and to rejoice in singing her praises in her humblest works. We may add that that habit of close and searching observation became introspective and extended itself to mental phenomena as well. So much so, that at one time it threatened to become a snare to him, and to make much of his poetry metaphysical, if not mystic; although, fortunately for our pleasure as for the poet's popularity, healthier and more natural impulses prevailed.

From his village he was sent to the grammar school of Louth in Lincolnshire, an establishment which, we believe, had even then a high local reputation. It was there that, in conjunction with his elder brother Charles, he produced the *Poems by Two Brothers*. The little volume was so far a pecuniary success that the copyright was bought for £10 by a local bookseller. In point of merit there is little more than we might have expected to be said for it, considering the ages of the authors and their inexperience. But it is interesting as showing now and again the germs of ideas which were to ripen later, and still more as illustrating the width of the young writers' reading and scholarship. The Tennysons must have come far nearer than most young gentlemen of their years to Macaulay's typical and omniscient schoolboy. There are not only numerous quotations from the English and French poets, but there are evidences of a scholarly acquaintance with the choicest of the Roman classics. "The Lover's Tale," which was written in 1828, is a proof of the judicious self-restraint which tempered Alfred Tennyson's ambition and self-assurance. Though printed a few years after it was written, it was never published till 1879, and only then because garbled extracts had got abroad. Yet the genius that was still immature had made wonderful progress in the meantime, and in the "Tale" we recognise the marked characteristics that were chastened down afterwards by thought and by exercise. We are struck already by the independence and originality of the youthful poet. It has been said, and no doubt said with truth, that the poem bears traces of the influence of Shelley, with whom in some respects Tennyson was much in sympathy. But, though the influence may be distinctly traced, there is no servile imitation, and there is the promise of not a few of the beauties that became very distinctly Tennyson's own.

In the year in which it was written the brothers went up to Cambridge, where they were entered at Trinity. There they were welcomed at once in as brilliant a circle of young and aspiring contemporaries as were ever assembled at that venerable seat of learning. We need only name among them Merivale and Spedding, Dean Alford, Archbishop Trench, Bishop Thirlwall, and Lord Houghton, Lord Stanley, Charles Buller, John Sterling, and the Lushingtons. Above all, and dearest of all, were Brookfield—to whom Tennyson was to dedicate one of the most beautiful of his sonnets—and Arthur Hallam, son of the historian, whose untimely death was the gain of literature, since it suggested the pathetic elegy of the "In Memoriam." The friendly intimacy of that gifted fellowship was to have a marked influence on his future and fortunes. That his mind was enriched we need hardly say by the cultured intercourse. But these youths, so many of whom were destined to high distinction, had formed themselves into what scoffers might call a mutual admiration society. They did justice, and more than justice, to Tennyson's poetical genius, and welcoming each fresh performance of his with affectionate sympathy and admiration, thenceforth they became the champions and guardians of his fame. It would have turned the head of a weaker man, and certainly it was no unmixed advantage to him, for Tennyson at no time undervalued his own powers. But, on the other hand, the ardent admiration of such critics was irresistible evidence of extraordinary talents; they set themselves to discover subtle or hidden meanings; they indicated the more conspicuous beauties with discriminating admiration, and, in short, they hurried the public judgment in the direction in which it must have drifted sooner or later. It is true, as we have remarked already, and shall notice again, that their obvious and excessive partiality provoked a reaction. Even if their praise of the beauties was not exaggerated, they were inclined to pass the faults and blemishes over in silence; so it was certain that other and less friendly judges would charge themselves with the less grateful part of the critic's duty. When Hallam indulged in the *Englishman's Magazine* in almost unstinted laudation, a writer in the *Quarterly*, believed to be Lockhart, and Wilson in *Blackwood*, seem to have felt bound to lay on the rod with extreme severity, greatly to Tennyson's displeasure and disgust. He had good reason to feel annoyed, if not aggrieved,

for the *Englishman's Magazine* was a comparatively obscure periodical, with no such authority as either of the others. Yet the skirmish of the pens, and the slashes which left him smarting, contributed to bring him fame and fresh admirers.

The occasion of the articles by Hallam and Wilson was the publication of a volume of *Poems Chiefly Lyrical*, which appeared in 1830, and contained not a few of the finest of his shorter effusions. Besides "Claribel," "Lilian," etc., there were "Mariana," "Oriana," and the "Recollections of the Arabian Nights." Hallam's article, obviously over-partial as it was, is still valuable for its delicately sympathetic appreciation. Tennyson, more than most, is a poet who should be read sympathetically ; and Hallam was at home with the mind that had cherished and fostered those graceful fancies. He analyses the distinctive features of the author's genius with fine discrimination, and in the main with a truth there is no disputing. But the article in *Blackwood* we must now take *cum grano*. It was written at a time when the rising Scotch periodical was waging relentless and unscrupulous war against what it denominated "The Cockney School," and all who were supposed in any way to be affiliated to that school. Tennyson's warmest admirers will hardly deny that there were passages, and even whole poems, which justified the characteristic criticisms of "Crusty Christopher." In more serious vein, Wilson gave the young *débutant* a great deal of excellent advice. He warned him against the danger to which we have alluded—of being too mystical and metaphysical. He remarked further on the tendency to mannerisms, and from mannerisms Tennyson has never altogether shaken himself free. But when Wilson turns from censure to praise, he shows as much critical prescience as good feeling. It was his habit to write in violent extremes, but no one could be more generously effusive. Even in his swing of reckless sarcasm he stops to say that the day may come when "Tennyson's genius will grow up and expand into a stately tree, embowering a solemn shade within a wide circumference." He gives the poet generous credit for fancy, imagination, and genius, and he comments upon the beauties he extracts by the page. From the "Ode to Memory," through "Oriana," to the "Recollections of the Arabian Nights," he rises from eulogy to something approaching rapture. What can be more graceful than the compliment to the cluster of beauties,

the Isabels and the Claribels? "We are in love, as an old man ought to be—as a father is with his ideal daughters—with them all." Nevertheless, it is not to be wondered at that Tennyson, though he may have had the wisdom to profit by the advice, was provoked to bitter retort.

The volume which followed in 1833 contained, among others, the poems of "Œnone," the "May Queen," and "The Dream of Fair Women." It was then that the *Quarterly* article nipped without crushing him, for, indeed, it was already clear that he was a poet, and a poet of exceeding sweetness and rare endowments. There was the ring of rich music in his melodious measures; he had the instinct of strangely harmonious cadences, which chimed in marvellously with his subjects, as in the refrain of "Mariana in the Moated Grange," and, above all, in the wildly plaintive burden of "Oriana." He had a luxuriant imagination that rather needed to be pruned; the gift of most realistic and yet poetical description; a happy selection of gracefully appropriate metaphor. He had a sweet intelligence of love in its changing moods; he could analyse the passions and dramatise them in action; he had powers of pathos and sympathy that awakened and soothed the affections. Within a limited range his versatility was remarkable. He drew on memory and observation for the descriptions of the "Moated Grange" or "Locksley Hall"; on exuberant fancy for the gorgeous scenery in the Oriental visions of the "Arabian Nights." There is as much of antithesis as of similarity in the "May Queen" and in "Œnone"; yet the feeling in the one as the passion in the other are equally simply and pleasingly true to nature.

Though a fertile and facile writer, Tennyson for one reason or another showed a self-restraint which poets who can afford it would do well to imitate. We know that he neither laid aside his pen nor let his faculties lie fallow, but for nearly ten years after 1833 he printed little. In 1842 appeared an edition of his poems in two volumes, consisting in great measure of reprints, but with some noteworthy additions. They were warmly welcomed, as they well might be. "The Two Voices" in itself might have made a poet's reputation. Many consider it Tennyson's masterpiece. Melodiously metaphysical, without being mystically obscure, it leads up through softly-flowing stanzas to the practical lessons that help us to carry the burdens of life; nor can anything be more artistic than the climax, which

whispers consolation and lets the glimmer of the dawn break gently through the darkness. Wordsworth remarked when he read the book that in the higher spheres of poetry Mr. Tennyson afforded the richest promise. "He will do great things yet, and ought to have done greater things by this time." He was soon to do greater things, or, at least, to undertake more important work. In the fragment of the "Morte d'Arthur" was the germ of the grand conception which was expanded in the "Idylls" and "The Holy Grail." These volumes, like the former, were praised and blamed; but now the praise immeasurably predominated. The best judges delighted to honour the rising star, and the *Quarterly* made something more than the *amende honorable*, though in this case, the writer being one of Tennyson's friends, some of the savour may have been taken out of the incense. If he had taken parody as flattery instead of blasphemous desecration, assuredly he would have had no reason to complain. Aytoun and Martin, in their *Bon Gaultier Ballads*, did much to popularise "Locksley Hall" and the "May Queen" among the classes who might have missed the beauties of the originals. His publishers paid him well; and he received besides a substantial tribute to his rising reputation in the shape of a pension of £200. We fear we must say that his prosperity provoked the envy of a man who should have been superior to petty jealousies. It was an unfortunate coincidence, to say the least, that in the very same year Lytton attacked Tennyson bitterly in the *New Timon*, and the attack was directed against the pensioner as much as the poet. Discreditable personalities were too much the fashion in those days, as Lytton himself was to learn to his cost when Thackeray fell foul of him in the *Epistles to the Literati*. And, to do Tennyson simple justice, he was by no means behindhand when he answered his enemy's challenge in the pages of *Punch*. There was clever portraiture as well as rough caricature in the stanzas—

> The padded man that wears the stays.

"The Princess" came out in 1847. It was the longest poem he had yet written, and he lost no reputation by it, if he gained little. It was a literal "medley" in which the beauties predominate, and where many exquisite sentiments found harmonious expression. In a second edition he seems to have

considered and laid to heart the severe strictures of some of the critics; although that does not necessarily follow, for he was in the habit of judging himself reflectively and dispassionately, recasting and polishing his work. He suppressed a few of the lines, he interpolated many others, and he introduced the brief lyrics dividing the chapters which are the sweetest and most attractive parts of the poem. He was in happier vein, and his warm affections had found a more congenial theme, when composing the "In Memoriam," which appeared two years after "The Princess." Tastes must differ widely as to styles and subjects; but on the whole the "In Memoriam" must be pronounced one of the finest, and the most finished, as it is the most thoughtful, of Tennyson's poems. Never did the memory of an unknown youth receive such signal honour, and by what appeared a sad and untimely death young Hallam secured a world-wide and deathless fame.

The success of the "In Memoriam" was wonderful, considering the sadness of subject. No idea could have seemed more morbid than that of ringing the changes in a monotony of lament for one long departed. There seemed something of affectation, too, in inviting the public to chime in with the unrestrained indulgence of a private grief. But these obvious objections were surmounted by the genuine pathos of the poet, and by his masterly methods of treatment. There was nothing morbid in the course of the plaintive strains, bringing sweet consolation out of grief, and hope out of despondency. The poet of the "Voices" drew new lessons from the discipline of sorrow, and pointed the struggling victims of time to the glorious promise of a blessed eternity. If the ring of "The Princess" was sometimes hollow and even harsh, nothing can be richer or more sonorous than the deep melodies of "In Memoriam."

The year 1850 was a memorable one for the poet, as well as for his admirers. He was married in the early summer, and appointed Laureate in the autumn. The wedding was at Shiplake Church, in Oxfordshire; his wife was the eldest daughter of Mr. Henry Sellwood, and a niece of Sir John Franklin. It was shortly afterwards that the death of Wordsworth left the Laureateship vacant. It was scarcely flattering to Tennyson that the only competitor seriously put forward was Leigh Hunt, another of the poets, by the way, whom Wilson

and Lockhart had satirised as singers of the Cockney School. Posterity will have no difficulty in deciding upon their comparative claims to precedence; and, indeed, the chief objection to the exercise of the Premier's patronage was that Tennyson was already a pensioner of the State. It may be doubted whether the Laureate's bays and mantle exercised a favourable influence on his poetry. In everything he has ever written we come as matter of course on fine ideas and noble passages. But no one of his court ditties, not even the welcome to the Princess of Wales, has risen in any great degree above the commonplace. Nor was "Maud," which came out in 1855, by any means one of his most successful efforts. Like "The Princess," its welcome by the reviewers was less warm than usual, and he had struck a key and taken a tone which was unlikely to popularise the poem. With such exceptions as the "Come into the Garden, Maud," which at once seized on the fancy, we missed some of the accustomed melody. The poet of sentiment, of nature, and the domestic affections, was scarcely at home in singing the praises of war.

Whether or no he had sunk in "The Princess" and in "Maud," he soared again in the "Idylls of the King" in a more daring flight than he had hitherto attempted. It was the fault of the fragmentary design that he had to await the full triumph. The "Idylls" in their completed form are in reality a grand epic. The cycle of the Arthurian legend had long engaged his fancy; he had touched it already in the "Morte d'Arthur" and elsewhere. It offered singular attractions to the chivalrous side of his genius; it gave rare opportunities for his statelier and more severe forms of diction. His fancy might freely indulge its flights in gilding a national and favourite romance; imagination might make what it would of myth and legend. Tennyson's ideal Arthur was the star of chivalry, the soul of honour, and the prince of purity, as well as the best and bravest lance among his Paladins. Virtue went hand in hand with valour at a Court which stood fast on the foundations of faith and chivalry in the surging sea of heathenism and barbarism. In the spotless Arthur, with his mysterious birth, we have something, if we may say so, like the antitype of the Saviour. He wears the form and bears the weapons of humanity; but he is too good for the world; even the wife who should have known him best wearies of his spotless perfection. And

in falling back upon Lancelot, she so far has our sympathy as a woman abandoning an unimaginable ideal for the noblest of frail and erring mortals. So that in our idea, save in the pathetic closing scene of forgiveness in "Guinevere," the very moral perfection of Arthur is a blemish, though, perhaps, an inevitable blemish, on the "Idylls." He fails to interest because we fail to conceive. As for meaner mortals, they are true enough to nature in the passions, the follies, and the caprices which are the common property of all ages and of men of every rank. We may say, indeed, that the passing brutality of Geraint to his wife, extenuated by that fierce outburst of suspicion, is far truer to probabilities in that barbarous age than the graceful deportment of the ladies or the stately courtesy of the knights. The seduction of Merlin, where the mighty sage and enchanter falls a victim to the wiles of a worthless siren, is unpleasing. But it is a scene of all times, and symbolical to boot; and by way of contrasts in companion pictures we have the gentle courtship of the knightly Geraint, and the death-love of the lily maid of Astolat. Yet, although the Arthur of the Idylls, the chivalrous champion of the holy Faith and of civilised order, had been purged of his impurities, still, in the blighting of friendship and love, and the darkening of his day-dreams, he was to expiate the faults of his hot youth.

The earlier parts of the poem—which appeared the last—explain its full significance. The root of evil and bitterness springs up in Modred, the fruit of the good King's youthful follies. So the golden promise of "The Coming of Arthur" is heavily clouded before the end. In "Gareth and Lynette" the allegory is obvious. The young Hope and Faith which are to work marvels for the redemption of a world groaning in guilt and under the oppression of tyranny are personified in the chivalrous purity of the youthful knight-errant who gives full and perfect service to the master he adores. Going forward from "Gareth and Lynette," through the "Enid" and onwards, we comprehend the scheme and moral of the connected epic, as we trace the growth of sin with the harvest of evils which bring sorrows and speedy expiations in their train. Sin and sorrow predominate in the "Pelleas and Ettarre," and they culminate in "Guinevere," in the crowning and most moving scene where Arthur, bending over his fallen Queen, tells her that it is his fate

to love her always, and that it is their destiny to be reunited when she has been purged by suffering.

Finally, in "The Passing of Arthur," the poet is at his grandest in painting the conflict of feelings in the wreck of hopes, when there is calm in the soul of the King amid the storms that are raging around him and beneath the black clouds that come drifting up. That group of idylls is a noble poem—rich in lofty lessons and noble thoughts; rich in scenes of romantic description that sparkle like gems in a golden setting; rich in the melody and yet the simplicity of the diction; rich in a rare profusion of felicitous fancies and similes. And with the appearance of that volume of wonderful verse the author's reputation culminated likewise. The "Holy Grail" did little for it, and, though "Enoch Arden" and "Aylmer's Field" were eagerly bought and widely circulated, we doubt if either has been often re-read. More remarkable, and certainly more original, were the two minor pieces of the "Northern Farmer," old and new styles, which were given to the public with "Aylmer's Field." They are not only notable as specimens of uncompromising provincial English, ingeniously moulded to the purposes of the poet; but there are strange depths of sad and cynical satire in the types of seemingly simple character that are photographed by unconscious self-revelation.

Before we pass from these, the best known of the Laureate's works, we may note that they contain a remarkable number of felicitous phrases—"jewels five words long," which have speedily become the common property of our literature. Many of them are so familiar, so classical, that one is apt to forget their origin: but "the grand old gardener," "the supreme Caucasian mind," "the caste of Vere de Vere," "the falsehood of extremes," "the fairy tales of science," "the touch of a vanished hand," "sweet girl graduates," "the rosebud garden of girls," "mealy-mouthed philanthropies," "immemorial elms," "a stony British stare," "faultily faultless," "the little rift within the lute," and the "chorus of indolent reviewers,"—these, and many others, are Tennyson's.

As a dramatist Tennyson cannot take his place among the greatest masters, though there are scenes and passages in the plays which will not be easily forgotten. Within certain limits he shows great dramatic power, but his range was limited. He plays on the feelings with a masterly touch, and many of his

characters are conceived with Velazquez-like realism and vigour. But he is conspicuously deficient in the flexibility of moods which lends itself lightly to changing attitudes, and identifies itself easily with an infinity of varying personalities. His finest piece is decidedly his *Queen Mary*, although even in that there is no great richness of dramatic fancy. Yet *Queen Mary* has many striking scenes, and would act well were it not too crowded with leading characters for good stage business. Mary is admirable, with her strong natural sagacity consciously subjugated to feminine weakness in spite of the warnings of her wisest counsellors, and her sister Elizabeth, though a slighter sketch, is perhaps even more spirited. Philip is represented, as we might imagine him in his youth, sensuous, yet cruel and a bigot in embryo, with an irrepressible disgust for the woman he is to wed, which he scarcely cares to conceal in his haughty selfishness. And Gardiner, a sturdy English patriot, though a zealot for the foreign faith, contrasts finely with the gentler Pole and the feebler but conscientious Cranmer. In *Becket* there are at least two great characters—the Prelate and the King—though perhaps the incarnation of the encroaching power of Rome is relegated too decidedly to the second place. *Harold* in human interest falls far below the others, possibly because the dramatist is groping among more shadowy personages and in more mythical history. *The Cup* and *The Falcon* were slighter efforts; and the *Promise of May* was not a success. In *Robin Hood*, published so lately as last March, it was evident that the poet had kept his delicacy of touch, and that the wand of the dramatist had not lost its charm. The play was long and in parts it dragged, but there were many redeeming passages of singular grace, and it was brightened with sparkling songs which breathed the very spirit of the greenwood. Yet even the brightest of the songs provoked not altogether favourable comparison with the lays and lyrics in Love Peacock's *Maid Marian*.

Tennyson's place among the poets was honourably recognised by the Universities many years ago. Oxford took the lead in 1855, instituting him a Doctor of Civil Law. Cambridge followed suit when the members of his own college placed the admirable bust by Mr. Woolmer in their library, and subsequently elected him to an honorary fellowship. In December 1885, the Laureate was raised to the peerage as Baron Tenny-

son of Aldworth in Sussex, and Freshwater in the Isle of Wight. Doubtless he appreciated the unprecedented honour paid to English poetry in his person, yet the distinction did not, perhaps, give much additional dignity to the new peer, considering the freedom with which titles of nobility have been lavished latterly. In the same year he brought out *Tiresias and other Poems.* The poems were undated, and it is doubtful when they were written, but for the most part they appear to bear the mark of a ripe, if not an over-ripe, maturity. They sing the old and favourite themes in the old familiar manner, and though they show neither barrenness of fancy nor enfeebling of the imaginative powers, they define the limits of the poet's conception and illustrate the monotony of his inspiration. In "Tiresias" he treads again the familiar classical ground, on the borderland between mythology and semi-mythical history, where human sympathies and passions are swayed by the unsympathetic gods, "who love and hate with mortal hates and loves," as they "move unseen among the ways of men." "Tiresias," although it gives the title to the volume, is short and slight. But there are fine passages in the impassioned appeal of the blind old prophet, who has still the vision of beauty that had blinded him burned in upon the brain, who is writhing under the sense of the predestined impotence, foreseeing calamities it is powerless to avert. "Despair" is a daring and unpleasing theme: the poem ends abruptly, like "Tiresias"; but in this case the abrupt termination, as it seems to us, is inartistic and eminently unsatisfactory. The poem breathes the raving despair of a would-be suicide saved sorely against his will from the sea that has swallowed his wife. It is the wail of a soul that foresees itself lost, and, anticipating the inconceivable horrors of hell, heaps curses on the cruel creed that has wrecked it. No ray of light breaks in upon the darkness, and the minister of religion to whom the ravings are addressed stands silenced and presumably self-convicted before the audacious blasphemer. "Balin and Balan" supplies a missing link in the series of the Idylls of Arthur's Court. It comes in as the prelude to "Merlin and Vivien," and one of the wandering brother-knights falls a victim to the wiles of the fair enchantress, when on the quest of a demon in a haunted forest. Wild and fanciful beyond the common, the chivalrous Christianity of Arthur's Court is brought face to face with the

insane asceticism of a superannuated recluse, and with the fiends and ministers of evil that are the survivals of expiring Heathendom. There is many a graceful fancy and many a melodious line; we remark again the Laureate's predilection for homely similes, and his extraordinary power of dignifying them in poetic dress, but we have never thought that "Balin and Balan" added to the reputation of the author of the Idylls. On the other hand, he never wrote anything better in its way, he never showed a lighter or more sprightly touch, than in "The Spinster's Sweet-Arts." It will be remembered that it is in the homely dialect of "The Northern Farmer." There is subtle and delicious comedy in the firmly-drawn character of the old maid, who might have been married many times for her money, and is very glad she never married, as she sits musing among the cats she confounds with the sweethearts, after whom she has named them.

Perhaps *Locksley Hall Sixty Years After*, published in 1886, excited more attention if it did not win more praise than any of the later poems. Pleasant old memories were awakened by the old name and the old flowing measure; curiosity was excited over the probable changes in the poet's mind, since it had cynically, under the blight that had befallen the lovelorn hero, surveyed the world and society of sixty years before. Curiosity was gratified, if fond expectations were not altogether fulfilled. The jilted lover of the shallow-hearted Amy had learnt lessons of wisdom with gathering years, and was in charity with his old rival, just dead, whose virtues he somewhat contemptuously recognised. But the reckless cynicism of youthful despair had given place to the pessimism of sad experience, and in the character of the poet-prophet denouncing the decadence of his age his individuality is merged in that of Tennyson. This latter-day "Locksley Hall" is a personal revelation; it expresses with a candour of earnestness there is no mistaking the political and social opinions, the prepossessions, the prejudices, the vain aspirations, and the vanished illusions of the venerable poet. Although now and again a couplet sounds unusually harsh; though here and there are gratuitous barbarisms of language, coined impetuously for the fiercer expression of burning indignation, on the whole it is a remarkable *tour de force*. The dominating idea is lofty and tragical. The poem is the wail of age over the sins and sorrows, the

crimes, the follies, and the foul abuses of a world that is "groaning and travailing" in misery, and hastening downwards through democratic demoralisation to decay. But the incidents and the details, as we have said, are often inevitably prosaic, and though scathing invective and stinging satire came readily enough, it was difficult to sustain the level of lofty verse in denouncing such real scourges of humanity and such social nuisances as the East-end sweaters or the Socialist stumporators. Yet the Laureate, having decided to sing out his soul, was not to be deflected from his course by subsidiary difficulties, and sometimes he soars in one of the highest of his flights when we should have expected him to come to the ground with crippled pinions. One couplet we might quote as holding up to scorn with fine irony the fond dreamers and the self-seeking anarchists who shadow out an ideal world which they fill with their wild chimeras—

> Hesper—Venus—were we native to that splendour or in Mars,
> We should see the Globe we groan in, fairest of their evening stars.

Another poem, which recurs to the memory at the moment of the poet's death, is the beautiful lyric "Crossing the Bar," which closed the last published volume of verses, *Demeter and Other Poems*. Extremely domesticated, the Laureate loved to relax with congenial talk in the society of congenial friends, and he delighted in doing the honours of the Sussex woodlands and the marine scenery which had so often inspired his muse. One of the surest ways to his heart was the admiration of that cherished scenery, and he says as much in his charming verses to General Hamley, the prologue to his ode on the Balaclava charge of the Heavy Brigade. Under pressure he would not infrequently read poetry of his own, though he much preferred to recite the poetry of others. But, with all his sympathetic appreciation, he was wanting in the gifts of an elocutionist, and his manner of reading was somewhat monotonous and unimpassioned. Since he rose into celebrity, his good-nature had been overtaxed by correspondents who submitted their manuscripts for examination and revision. Repeatedly he raised a cry of expostulation in our columns, and so lately as December 1885, we published a letter, declaring, once for all, that he was overwhelmed with such unscrupulous requests, and imploring immunity from them for the future. Another

of the drawbacks to his world-wide reputation was the persecutions he had to endure from obtrusive notoriety-hunters. The familiar figure will long linger in the recollections of the sightseers who had the good fortune to catch a glimpse of the shy quarry they were stalking. They will remember him as he appears on the canvas of Millais, with the soft felt hat in the hand, and the thin grey beard falling over the well-worn Inverness cape, which is almost as much associated with the personality of Tennyson as their mantles with the memories of Moses or Elijah.

Lady Tennyson survives her husband. Of the poet's two sons, the elder, Hallam, who has been in latter years his father's constant companion and secretary, survives him, and succeeds to the title. He married, in 1884, Audrey Georgiana Florence, daughter of Mr. Charles John Boyle, and has two sons. The poet's younger son, Lionel, died in 1886, leaving a widow, the daughter of Mr. Frederick Locker-Lampson, and three sons. Mrs. Lionel Tennyson has since married Mr. Augustine Birrell, M.P.

SIR RICHARD OWEN

1804–1892

OBITUARY NOTICE, MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1892

SIR R. OWEN was the youngest son of Richard Owen, of Bucks. He was born at Lancaster on the 20th of July 1804; and was sent while young to the grammar-school of his native town, where he first made the acquaintance of Whewell, afterwards the illustrious Master of Trinity College, Cambridge—an acquaintance that ripened into a lasting friendship, only ended by the death of Dr. Whewell. He soon showed a taste for the study of medicine, and in 1824 matriculated in the University of Edinburgh, entering St. Bartholomew's Hospital in London, as a student, in the following year, and taking his diploma at the Royal College of Surgeons, London, in 1826. It was in this year that he published his first paper on "The Calculus of the Urinary Bladder." While at St. Bartholomew's he had been one of the dissectors to the famous surgeon Abernethy, who soon discerned that he had a special taste for anatomy; but at this time there appeared no opening for the pursuit of a purely scientific career, and, on the completion of his professional studies, Owen settled down to practise in Serle Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

As a well-read man, with musical abilities of no mean order, he was soon the centre of a select social set, many of whom remained in after-life his constant friends. Another phase of that life was, however, at hand, and Owen was not destined for long to attend to the ailments of young barristers or solicitors' clerks. The collection of the famous John Hunter had recently been purchased by the Government; the care of it had been

vested in trustees; and it became part of their duty to see that it was catalogued, and that a series of lectures should be given each year in illustration of its contents. The collection itself had been stored in the College of Surgeons, but up to 1828 no attempt at making a catalogue of it had been made. The attention of the trustees was called to this breach of trust, and Mr. Abernethy insisted on his old pupil Owen undertaking the task —"the collection was located near his private residence; he could devote his leisure hours to the work; there was no one else equally qualified to do so." Owen assented. At this time William Clift was the Conservator of the Museum of the College of Surgeons, with his own special duties to perform; he resided by the college, and he had one son and one daughter. His son was to be his successor, and part of the bargain would appear to have been that when the Hunterian collection had been catalogued Owen was to betake himself once more to the full pursuit of his profession, and not to think of comparative anatomy again. The first part of this catalogue was published in 1830.

In this year the scientific meetings of the Zoological Society of London were instituted, the first meeting being held on 9th November 1830, at which Owen read an interesting paper on the anatomy of the Ourang-outang. In 1832 he published an admirable monograph on the Pearly Nautilus, which was illustrated by many elaborate drawings from his own pencil. During this period he was steadily pursuing his profession, and was a constant attendant at, and a reader of papers before, the Medical and Chirurgical Society of London and the Medical Society of St. Bartholomew's. One of the most remarkable of these papers was that describing the anatomical results of the ligature of the internal iliac artery by Dr. Stevens at Santa Cruz in 1812. Dr. Stevens had performed this then heroic operation on a negro, and saved his patient's life; but on his reporting the case it was pretty generally disbelieved in, and it was asserted that the artery had never been tied. The negro afterwards died of some acute disease, and, determined to settle the point and prove the accuracy of his assertion, Dr. Stevens sent the body to London in a barrel of Jamaica rum, to have the anatomical question settled by independent authority. This Owen was able to do beyond all doubt, and thus to vindicate the skill and courage of Dr. Stevens.

During the troubles that ensued on the abdication of Charles X.

of France, Baron Cuvier had found it convenient to visit London, where he soon made the acquaintance of Owen. On Cuvier's return to Paris, to serve under the Orleanist *régime*, he invited Owen to visit that city, which he did in 1831. Cuvier was then hard at work with Valenciennes on their great history of fishes, over which he spent from six to ten hours a day. The fossil vertebrate collection then examined by Owen seems to have made a great impression on him, and to have given a direction to his after studies of fossil remains in which he so eminently distinguished himself.

In Lincoln's Inn Fields all was at this time going on pleasantly, patients were increasing, the Hunterian collection was being catalogued. In 1834 Owen discovered the *Trichina spiralis* (since notable in trichinosis), and at the age of thirty he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. His own hospital elected him in the same year to their newly-established Chair of Comparative Anatomy, and the daughter of the Conservator of the Museum of the College of Surgeons had promised to give him her hand, and had already given him her heart. It was conceded by all that William Home Clift was to succeed his father, but he was not destined to survive him.

One day in 1834, while that father was in the country on a short holiday, the son was driving home in a cab to Lincoln's Inn Fields. The cab too rapidly turned up Chancery Lane out of Fleet Street, was upset in the act, and young Clift, who was probably looking out of the cab window at the moment, was pitched on his head, and in a few minutes taken up insensible. Recognised by none, he was carried to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, there to be received by Owen. His injury was a fracture at the base of the skull, and his death speedily followed. Owen had to communicate the news to Clift's old father, whose sorrow was only assuaged by a promise that Owen would take the son's place, and never desert him or the Museum.

After his marriage to Miss Clift he succeeded, in 1836, Sir Charles Bell as Professor of Anatomy and Physiology to the College of Surgeons, and the Trustees of the Hunterian Museum having about this time established the Hunterian Professorship, Owen was elected thereto. In 1837 he edited *Hunter's Animal Economy*, and continued to fill both chairs until 1855; during this time he published ten more volumes of the catalogue of the Hunterian collection, and on Mr. Clift's death he became also

Conservator of the Museum. He now gradually retired from the practice of his profession and devoted himself entirely to scientific pursuits. It is quite amazing to take even a rapid survey of the amount of work published during this period. Not again to refer to the volumes of catalogues, nor to the very numerous memoirs contributed to the Royal and other learned societies, the following may be mentioned :—The volumes on *Odontography*, the *Lectures on Comparative Anatomy*, on *The Archetype and Homologies of the Vertebrate Skeleton*, on *The Nature of Limbs*, on *Parthenogenesis*, many volumes on *The British Fossil Reptiles*, on *The Gigantic Fossil Birds of New Zealand*, on *Fossil Mammals of Australia*, and on *The Great Megatherium of America*.

But while thus leaving no day without some record of scientific work, Owen gave his leisure to affairs more immediately interesting to his fellow-men. From 1843 to 1846 he sat on the Commission to inquire into the Health of Towns. He contributed in 1845 a special report on the sanitary condition of his native town of Lancaster, and the greatly improved system of drainage now adopted in that town, and its constant supply of water at high pressure, followed on this report. He was appointed as one of the Commissioners on the Health of the Metropolis in 1846-1848, and, again, on the Commission to inquire into the Meat Supply in 1849. It was on the report of this latter Commission that the present cattle-market was established at Islington and the famous old market at Smithfield was suppressed. Professor Owen was one of the Commission for the Great Exhibition of 1851. He was engaged in directing and selecting the extinct animals placed in the geological section of the grounds of the Crystal Palace. In 1852 the Queen offered him a residence in Kensington. The then King of Hanover disputed the right of the British Crown to the premises, which right it was in time proved that the Crown did possess. Sheen Lodge, Richmond Park, just then, however, became vacant, and Professor Owen mentioned to the Prince Consort that, if he were allowed the choice, he would prefer the cottage to the larger mansion. At first the Prince refused to agree to this, but finding out that the salaries of scientific men were not as large as he had imagined, he gave way, and on representing matters to the Queen, Sheen Lodge was at once offered to and accepted by Professor Owen.

Professor Owen's connection with the Royal College of

Surgeons ceased in 1856, in which year he was appointed Superintendent of the Department of Natural History in the British Museum. It was generally understood that this post was specially made for Owen ; he had had no connection previously with the Museum, and it is not, perhaps, to be wondered at that his promotion over the heads of a number of most eminent biologists on the staff of the Museum should have given rise to some little umbrage, if not on the part of the individual officers, at least on that of their friends. It is pleasant to record that the relations of the new chief with the then senior assistants, all of whom have now passed away, were of a friendly and cordial character.

For some years before Owen's reign at the National Museum began, Dr. John Edward Gray, whose name will always be held in honour for what he accomplished for the natural history collection of the Museum, had repeatedly called the attention of the trustees to the excessively crowded state of the zoological specimens. Urgently did he call for more room. The splendid series of birds, the magnificent collection of shells, were to be only half seen, while ton-weights of treasure were filling up the vaults and passages underground. Numerous were the suggestions which were made to remedy this state of things, but none of them seemed to meet the case. The Government of the day had set their faces against purchasing any ground in the vicinity of Great Russell Street, or of adding any merely temporary accommodation to the existing galleries, and had resolved rather to sever the Natural History Department altogether from the British Museum. The desirableness of this was stoutly contested by many—indeed, by the vast majority of scientific men ; but, with a remarkably keen insight into the future, it seemed to Professor Owen to be unwise, and, indeed, even wrong, to hazard the safety and utility of these vast collections by persisting in the advocacy of a course which was futile—"he loved the site in Bloomsbury much, but he loved space for the collections much more." In 1857 Panizzi in his annual report stated "that he was precluded from even speculating on the possibility of the natural history collections being ever detached from the rest of the Museum."

In 1861, during a debate in Committee of the House of Commons on the Civil Service Estimates, Sir (then Mr.) W. H. Gregory said—

"He wished to open the eyes of the public to the outrageous proposition which the Government had apparently entertained in 1859; for it would appear that on the 10th of July in that year Professor Owen had submitted a plan to the Trustees of the British Museum, in which he said that with the utmost economy of space he should require for the present wants of his collection, and for its probable expansion within the next thirty years, a one-storied building covering ten acres, or one of two stories covering five acres. . . He regretted that a man whose name stood so high as Professor Owen's should connect himself with so foolish, crazy, and extravagant a scheme, and should persevere in it after the folly had been pointed out by most unexceptionable witnesses."

The then Chancellor of the Exchequer regretted the allusions made by the hon. member for Galway to "the greatest living naturalist, whose splendid genius and high character ought to have exempted him from having been the object of the terms indulged in." In 1862 the Bill for the removal of certain portions of the British Museum was introduced. The second reading was moved on the 19th of May by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Mr. Disraeli had the same evening concluded one of his most remarkable speeches on the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill by accusing the Liberal party of a "lavish expenditure of public money." The House was in a fever for retrenchment when the order for the second reading of the Museum Bill came on. Mr. W. H. Gregory moved that the Bill be read a second time that day three months, and, despite the pleadings of Lord Palmerston and Mr. Monckton Milnes, the Government were defeated by a majority of 92 in a House of 234 members. In special answer to a leading article in our columns, in which we asked, "What, then, does Professor Owen demand?" he published a work *On the Extent and Aims of a National Museum of Natural History.* As a final result, the Government obtained the sanction of Parliament in 1872 to the erection at South Kensington of the magnificent range of buildings there erected, and the space that is now placed at the disposal of the superintendent is one not of five, but of over seven acres. In 1872 also the freedom of the City of London was conferred upon Owen.

In obtaining the splendid mansion in which to store the treasures of nature Professor Owen saw accomplished the

crowning ambition of his long and arduous life. To most it would have been like the beginning of a new life: to him it was but the expansion of his old life. He entered on the new work with enthusiasm. On Easter Monday, 1881, the New Museum of Natural History was opened for the first time to the public, on which occasion it was visited by some 16,000 persons. In only some of the galleries were the collections arranged, but with a willing staff the task of arrangement made great progress, and by the close of 1883 was nearly completed. Then it was that Owen retired from the position which he had filled for well-nigh twenty-seven years, leaving the guidance of the affairs of the Museum to younger and very able hands. The necessary and often trying routine work required of Professor Owen, as the head of so large a department (since 1855), does not seem to have checked his great mental activity, nor to have diminished his extraordinary productiveness as an author.

The record of his contributions to science during this period equals, if it does not surpass, that when he was at the College of Surgeons. Among the more important of these we must notice:—*Memoir on the British Fossil Reptiles of the Mesozoic Formations — Pterodactyles*, 1873-1877; *On the British Fossil Reptiles of the Liassic Formations—Icthyosaurs and Plesiosaurs*, 1865-1870; *On the British Fossil Cetacea of the Red Crag*, 1870; *On the Fossil Reptiles of South Africa*, 1876; *On the Classification and Geographical Distribution of Mammals*, 1859; and a *Manual of Palæontology*, 1861. The long list of papers published in the *Proceedings* of learned societies, to be found in the Royal Society's invaluable catalogue (numbering over 360), includes many, the scientific value of which would alone have given abiding fame to their author.

It would be impossible here to give even a tithe of their titles, but we quote a few to show that Professor Owen left few of the classes of the animal kingdom unexamined:—On the Andaman Islanders; on the Anthropoid Apes; on the Aye-Aye; on the Giraffe; on the Great Anteater; on the Great Auk; on the Dodo; on *Apteryx Australis*; on *Lepidosiren annectens*; on *Argonauta argo*; on *Spirula Australis*; on *Clavigella*; on *Limulus polyphemus*; on *Entozoa*; on *Euplectella cucumis* and *E. aspergillum*. Perhaps Owen's *magnum opus* is the richly-illustrated *History of British Fossil Reptiles*, in

three volumes, published in 1884, in which the memoirs already mentioned, along with others, were collected. Although Owen retired in 1883 from his official position, his activity as a scientific worker did not cease, and up to a very recent date he continued to contribute papers to the Royal Society, one of the latest of these being read on 6th December 1888, on "Thylacopardus Australis," an extinct feline mammal of New South Wales.

It was scarcely possible that a life like Owen's could have been passed without controversy. As long as scientific men confine themselves to the recording of facts—though mistakes may be made as to what a fact is—there will be little room for opposition. If facts are their *forte*, speculation now and then betrays their foible, and the speculations of one man are but too apt to seem a very folly in the eyes of another. Still, speculation often leads to the discovery of facts, and perhaps no really impartial critic would say that Owen's numerous speculative treatises — on the Extinction of Species, on the Classification of the Mammals by Brain Characters, on the Ideal Vertebrate Type—were without their value, still less that they detracted in any serious nature from the sterling work which he has left behind him for the benefit of scientific men. Owen's attitude to Darwinism can hardly be said to have been actively hostile. He was naturally loth to renounce his own pet theory of "Archetypes" in favour of the new doctrine. Still, though not a disciple of Darwin, the researches of Owen did much to furnish proofs of the probability of the great doctrine of evolution.

To know Owen as a man of science, as the eloquent lecturer, or as the courteous man of business, was to know but half the man. A well-educated musician, well read in history and literature, full of sparkling anecdote, an admirable reader, he had a great share of those genial social qualities that tend to make a man, even when not otherwise distinguished, beloved. In his early days, as a Professor in Lincoln's Inn Fields, he proved himself an able lecturer. He had often critical audiences, among whom were Wilberforce, Hallam, Rogers, Sir Robert Peel—even when Prime Minister—and a host of other well-known men. Scientific men born in countries not our own came to London from time to time to pay him their respects, and many can still testify to the pleasant moments

spent on the green lawn of Sheen Lodge, with the Royal Park of Richmond opening on the view. There, even up to within the last few years, he was able to receive and enjoy the company of old acquaintances.

In concluding this short sketch of a distinguished career we add the chief honours he received. In 1842 the Royal Society conferred on him the Royal Medal for his memoirs on the General Economy of the Monotremes and Marsupials. In 1846 the same society decreed to him the Copley Medal. In 1851 the King of Prussia sent to him the Ordre pour le Mérite. In 1855 the Emperor of the French bestowed on him the cross of the Légion d'Honneur. The Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin conferred on him honorary degrees. The Royal College of Surgeons of Ireland made him an Honorary Fellow, and most of the European and American Societies numbered his name on their lists of honorary or corresponding members. In 1857 he was elected President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. In 1859 he was chosen one of the eight foreign associates of the Institute of France (in succession to Robert Brown). The Emperor of Brazil, in 1873, gave him the Imperial Order of the Rose, while in the same year the Queen conferred on him the Order of the Bath, of which Order he was made a Knight Commander in December 1883, on the occasion of his resigning the post of Superintendent of the Natural History Museum. In 1874 the Academy of Medicine, Paris, elected him as one of their foreign associates, in succession to Baron Liebig. In 1882 the King of Italy sent him the Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazare.

END OF VOL. V.

Printed by R. & R. Clark, Limited, *Edinburgh.*

MACMILLAN'S THREE-AND-SIXPENNY LIBRARY

OF

WORKS BY POPULAR AUTHORS.

In Crown 8vo. Cloth extra. Price 3s. 6d. each.

By ROLF BOLDREWOOD.

SATURDAY REVIEW.—"Mr. Boldrewood can tell what he knows with great point and vigour, and there is no better reading than the adventurous parts of his books."

PALL MALL GAZETTE.—"The volumes are brimful of adventure, in which gold, gold-diggers, prospectors, claim-holders, take an active part."

Robbery under Arms.
The Squatter's Dream.
A Colonial Reformer.
The Miner's Right.
A Sydney-Side Saxon.
Nevermore.
A Modern Buccaneer.

By HUGH CONWAY.

MORNING POST.—"Life-like, and full of individuality."

DAILY NEWS.—"Throughout written with spirit, good feeling, and ability, and a certain dash of humour."

Living or Dead? | **A Family Affair.**

By MRS. CRAIK.

(The Author of 'JOHN HALIFAX, GENTLEMAN.')

Olive. With Illustrations by G. BOWERS.
The Ogilvies. With Illustrations.
Agatha's Husband. With Illustrations.
Head of the Family. With Illustrations.
Two Marriages. | **The Laurel Bush.**
About Money, and other Things.
My Mother and I. With Illustrations.
Miss Tommy: A Mediæval Romance. Illustrated.
King Arthur: Not a Love Story.
Sermons out of Church.
Concerning Men, and other Papers.

By F. MARION CRAWFORD.

SPECTATOR.—"With the solitary exception of Mrs. Oliphant we have no living novelist more distinguished for variety of theme and range of imaginative outlook than Mr. Marion Crawford."

Mr. Isaacs: A Tale of Modern India. Portrait of Author.
Dr. Claudius: a True Story.
A Roman Singer.
Zoroaster.
Marzio's Crucifix.
A Tale of a Lonely Parish.
Paul Patoff.
With the Immortals.
Greifenstein.
Sant' Ilario.
A Cigarette-Maker's Romance.
Khaled.
The Three Fates.
The Witch of Prague.
Children of the King.
Marion Darche.
Pietro Ghisleri.
Katharine Lauderdale.
Don Orsino.

By SIR HENRY CUNNINGHAM, K.C.I.E.

ST. JAMES'S GAZETTE.—"Interesting as specimens of romance, the style of writing is so excellent—scholarly and at the same time easy and natural—that the volumes are worth reading on that account alone. But there is also masterly description of persons, places, and things; skilful analysis of character; a constant play of wit and humour; and a happy gift of instantaneous portraiture."

The Cœruleans. | **The Heriots.** | **Wheat and Tares.**

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.

MACMILLAN'S THREE-AND-SIXPENNY LIBRARY.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each volume.

By CHARLES DICKENS.

The Pickwick Papers.
Oliver Twist.
Nicholas Nickleby.
Martin Chuzzlewit.
The Old Curiosity Shop.
Barnaby Rudge.
Dombey and Son.
Christmas Books.
Sketches by Boz.
David Copperfield.
American Notes and Pictures from Italy.
The Letters of Charles Dickens.
Bleak House.

By MARY ANGELA DICKENS.

A Mere Cypher. | **A Valiant Ignorance.**

By BRET HARTE.

SPEAKER.—"The best work of Mr. Bret Harte stands entirely alone . . . . marked on every page by distinction and quality. . . . Strength and delicacy, spirit and tenderness, go together in his best work."

Cressy. | **The Heritage of Dedlow Marsh.**
A First Familyof Tasajara.

By THOMAS HUGHES.

Tom Brown's Schooldays. With Illustrations by A. HUGHES and S. P. HALL.
Tom Brown at Oxford. With Illustrations by S. P. HALL.
The Scouring of the White Horse, and The Ashen Faggot. With Illustrations by RICHARD DOYLE.

By HENRY JAMES.

SATURDAY REVIEW.—"He has the power of seeing with the artistic perception of the few, and of writing about what he has seen, so that the many can understand and feel with him."

WORLD.—"His touch is so light, and his humour, while shrewd and keen, so free from bitterness."

A London Life. | **The Aspern Papers.** | **The Tragic Muse.**

By ANNIE KEARY.

SPECTATOR.—"In our opinion there have not been many novels published better worth reading. The literary workmanship is excellent, and all the windings of the stories are worked with patient fulness and a skill not often found."

Castle Daly.
A York and a Lancaster Rose.
Oldbury.
A Doubting Heart.
Janet's Home.
Nations around Israel.

By W. CLARK RUSSELL.

TIMES.—"Mr. Clark Russell is one of those writers who have set themselves to revive the British sea story in all its glorious excitement. Mr. Russell has made a considerable reputation in this line. His plots are well conceived, and that of 'Marooned' is no exception to this rule."

Marooned. | **A Strange Elopement.**

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.

MACMILLAN'S THREE-AND-SIXPENNY SERIES.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each volume.

By CHARLES KINGSLEY.

Westward Ho! | Hypatia.
Yeast. | Alton Locke.
Two Years Ago.
Hereward the Wake. | Poems.
The Heroes. | The Water Babies.
Madam How and Lady Why.
At Last | Prose Idylls.
Plays and Puritans, etc.
The Roman and the Teuton.
Sanitary and Social Lectures and Essays.
Historical Lectures and Essays.
Scientific Lectures and Essays.
Literary and General Lectures.
The Hermits.
Glaucus: or the Wonders of The Seashore. With Coloured Illustrations.
Village and Town and Country Sermons.
The Water of Life, and other Sermons.
Sermons on National Subjects, and the King of the Earth.
Sermons for the Times.
Good News of God.
The Gospel of the Pentateuch, and David.
Discipline, and other Sermons.
Westminster Sermons.
All Saints' Day, and other Sermons.

By D. CHRISTIE MURRAY.

SPECTATOR.—"Mr. Christie Murray has more power and genius for the delineation of English rustic life than any half-dozen of our surviving novelists put together."

SATURDAY REVIEW.—"Few modern novelists can tell a story of English country life better than Mr. D. Christie Murray."

Aunt Rachel. | Schwartz.
John Vale's Guardian. | The Weaker Vessel.
He Fell among Thieves. D. C. MURRAY and H. HERMAN.

By Mrs. OLIPHANT.

ACADEMY.—"At her best she is, with one or two exceptions, the best of living English novelists."

SATURDAY REVIEW.—"Has the charm of style, the literary quality and flavour that never fails to please."

A Beleaguered City. | Joyce.
Neighbours on the Green.
Kirsteen. | Hester. | Sir Tom.
A Country Gentleman and his Family.
The Curate in Charge.
The Second Son.
He that Will Not when He May.
The Railway Man and his Children.
The Marriage of Elinor.
The Heir-Presumptive and the Heir-Apparent.
A Son of the Soil. | The Wizard's Son.
Young Musgrave.
Lady William.

By J. H. SHORTHOUSE.

ANTI-JACOBIN.—"Powerful, striking, and fascinating romances."

John Inglesant. | The Countess Eve.
Sir Percival. | A Teacher of the Violin.
The Little Schoolmaster Mark. | Blanche, Lady Falaise.

By FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE.

Sermons Preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel. In 6 vols.
Christmas Day, and other Sermons.
Theological Essays.
Prophets and Kings.
Patriarchs and Lawgivers.
The Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven.
Gospel of St. John.
Epistles of St. John.
Lectures on the Apocalypse.
Friendship of Books.
Social Morality.
Prayer Book and Lord's Prayer.
The Doctrine of Sacrifice.
Acts of the Apostles.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.

MACMILLAN'S THREE-AND-SIXPENNY SERIES.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each volume.

By CHARLOTTE M. YONGE.

The Heir of Redclyffe.
Heartsease. | Hopes and Fears.
Dynevor Terrace. | The Daisy Chain.
The Trial: More Links of the Daisy Chain.
Pillars of the House. Vol. I.
Pillars of the House. Vol. II.
The Young Stepmother.
The Clever Woman of the Family.
The Three Brides.
My Young Alcides. | The Caged Lion.
The Dove in the Eagle's Nest.
The Chaplet of Pearls.
Lady Hester, and the Danvers Papers.
Magnum Bonum. | Love and Life.
Unknown to History. | Stray Pearls.
The Armourer's 'Prentices.
The Two Sides of the Shield.
Nuttie's Father.
Scenes and Characters.
Chantry House.
A Modern Telemachus. | Bye-Words.
Beechcroft at Rockstone.
More Bywords.
A Reputed Changeling.
The Little Duke.
The Lances of Lynwood.
The Prince and the Page.
P's and Q's, and Little Lucy's Wonderful Globe.
Two Penniless Princesses.
That Stick.
An Old Woman's Outlook.
Grisly Grisell.

By ARCHDEACON FARRAR.

Seekers after God.
Eternal Hope. | The Fall of Man.
The Witness of History to Christ.
The Silence and Voices of God.
In the Days of thy Youth.
Saintly Workers. | Ephphatha.
Mercy and Judgment.
Sermons and Addresses in America.

By VARIOUS WRITERS.

SIR S. W. BAKER.—True Tales for My Grandsons.
W. FORBES-MITCHELL.—Reminiscences of the Great Mutiny, 1857-59.
FRANCES HODGSON BURNETT.—Louisiana; and That Lass o' Lowrie's.
R. BLENNERHASSETT AND L. SLEEMAN.—Adventures in Mashonaland.
Sir MORTIMER DURAND, K.C.I.E.—Helen Treveryan.
'English Men of Letters' Series. In 13 Monthly Volumes, each Volume containing three books.
LANOE FALCONER.—Cecilia de Noël.
ARCHIBALD FORBES.—Barracks, Bivouacs, and Battles.—Souvenirs of Some Continents.
W. W. FOWLER.—Tales of the Birds. Illustrated by BRYAN HOOK. A Year with the Birds. Illustrated by BRYAN HOOK.
Rev. J. GILMORE.—Storm Warriors.
P. KENNEDY.—Legendary Fictions of the Irish Celts.
HENRY KINGSLEY.—Tales of Old Travel.
MARGARET LEE.—Faithful and Unfaithful.
AMY LEVY.—Reuben Sachs.
S. R. LYSAGHT.—The Marplot.
LORD LYTTON.—The Ring of Amasis.
M. M'LENNAN.—Muckle Jock, and other Stories of Peasant Life.
LUCAS MALET.—Mrs. Lorimer.
GUSTAVE MASSON.—A French Dictionary.
A. B. MITFORD.—Tales of Old Japan.
MAJOR G. PARRY.—The Story of Dick.
E. C. PRICE.—In the Lion's Mouth.
W. C. RHOADES.—John Trevennick.
THE WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE. Vol. I. Comedies. Vol. II. Histories. Vol. III. Tragedies. 3 vols.
FLORA A. STEEL.—Miss Stuart's Legacy.—The Flower of Forgiveness.
MARCHESA THEODOLI.—Under Pressure.
"TIMES" Summaries.—Biographies of Eminent Persons. In 4 vols.—Annual Summaries. In 2 vols.
Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD.—Miss Bretherton.
MONTAGU WILLIAMS, Q.C.—Leaves of a Life.—Later Leaves.—Round London: Down East, and Up West.
Hogan, M.P.—Tim.—The New Antigone.—Flitters, Tatters, etc.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.

50.8.96

CT
119
T55
v.5

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

3 1205 00386 6447

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

A 001 083 915 7